Analysis and Design of Secured/Resilient Closed-loop Control Systems

Sérgio Pequito † Farshad Khorrami ‡ Prashanth Krishnamurthy ‡ George J. Pappas †

arXiv:1511.02963v1 [math.OC] 10 Nov 2015

Abstract

In this paper, structural properties of distributed control systems and pairing of sensors and actuators are considered to generate architectures which are resilient to attacks/hacks for industrial control systems and other complex cyber-physical systems. Additionally, techniques for implementation of a given control system in a decentralized manner are addressed that will yield additional resiliency and fault-tolerance. In particular, we consider inherent structural properties such as internal fixed modes of a dynamical system depending on actuation, sensing, and interconnection/communication structure for linear discrete time-invariant dynamical systems. Firstly, we address the problem of determining the minimum number of actuators, sensors, and communication among them, such that desirable control objectives of the closed-loop system are achieved while enhancing resiliency and security of the control system. We aim to attain stability and performance objectives under disruptive scenarios such as attacks by a malicious agent on actuators, sensors, and communication components and natural failures. The key inherent structural property utilized in this paper is the notion of fixed modes which will determine the closed-loop control system performance. The fixed modes are dependent on the interconnections of the system as well as location and pairing of sensors and actuators in a complex dynamical system. Therefore, the main contributions of this paper are fourfold: (i) introduction of the notion of resilient fixed-modes free system that ensures the non-existence of fixed modes when the actuation-sensing-communication structure is compromised; (ii) a graph-theoretical representation that ensures almost always the non-existence of resilient fixed modes; (iii) a solution to the problem of designing the minimum actuation-sensing-communication structure that ensures a system without resilient fixed modes almost always; and (iv) determine, for a parametrized system, the gain satisfying the sparsity of a given information pattern by resorting to convex optimization tools. The different strategies to deploy actuators, sensors, and establishing communication between these are provided such that the system is resilient fixed-modes free; in particular, in order to show to show the efficacy of the proposed methodologies these results are applied in the context of the power electric grid.

This work was supported in part by the TerraSwarm Research Center, one of six centers supported by the STARnet phase of the Focus Center Research Program (FCRP) a Semiconductor Research Corporation program sponsored by MARCO and DARPA, and the NSF ECCS-1306128 grant.

†Department of Electrical and Systems Engineering, School of Engineering and Applied Science, University of Pennsylvania

‡Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Polytechnic Institute of New York University

I. Introduction

Complex cyber-physical and industrial control systems (ICS) are prevalent in a wide range of application domains such as multi-agent networks, infrastructure systems such as the electric power grid, process control and manufacturing systems, to name a few [1]–[4]. Modern ICS are complex interconnected combinations of hardware and software components and comprise of various facets/subsystems including sensors and actuators, the physical dynamical systems/processes that are being controlled, computational systems (e.g., microprocessors, programmable logic controllers – PLCs), and communication mechanisms. Over the last several decades, industrial control units (such as PLCs) have evolved from simple stand-alone units to complex highly networked units. With the increasing complexity and connectivity of cyber-physical systems, the potential attack surface for cyber attacks is also increasing [5]–[10]. A report by Dell states that attacks on SCADA systems for ICS have increased by a factor two from 2013 to 2014. The highest number of attacks were related to the energy sector followed by the critical manufacturing sector. In addition to generic communications/networking based attacks, cyber-physical systems are potentially a target for process-aware attacks (e.g., Stuxnet and the attack on German steel mill plant) that aim to disrupt the proper functioning or efficiency of the physical systems/processes of the cyber-physical system by modifying the information flow or the computational behavior of the system, so as to negatively impact the functioning of the real-time control system aspect of the cyber-physical system. Hence, to achieve robust resiliency of critical cyber-physical systems, it is vital to develop resilient control design, architectures, and implementation methodologies that can offer robustness to various classes of cyber attacks that attempt to utilize some knowledge of the overall cyber-physical dynamic system to modify the closed-loop control system behavior. In general, such attacks might directly attempt modification of the computational nodes themselves or might attempt modifications of the information flow between computational nodes, sensors, and actuators, possibly with spurious/modified messages specifically crafted to fit within the semantic context of the dynamic process (e.g., spurious sensor messages within valid limits but with incorrect data).

Hence, control design and implementation techniques for cyber-security and resiliency that can offer robustness to various classes of cyber-attacks on a cyber-physical system are of high relevance in a wide variety of application contexts including, for example, autonomous vehicles, industrial machinery, power systems, tele-operation applications, etc. There are, in general, various types of attacks relevant in a cyber-physical control system application including:

- modification of the behavior (control parameters, logic, timing, or run-time process variables) of a computational node within the system (e.g., a computer implementing a controller);
- modification of messages between computational nodes;

- modification of sensor or actuator messages/signals, e.g., modifying the readings from some subset of the sensors within the system.

These types of attacks are inherently inter-coupled. For example, an attack that modifies logic of a computational node in a distributed control system can modify information that it transmits to other nodes so that from the perspective of other nodes, a logic modification can manifest as a sensor/information message modification. Also, attacks that attempt to modify/drop inter-node communications can, from a distributed control system perspective, be considered as attacks that modify incoming sensor/information messages at nodes. To develop a truly cyber-resilient system, each computational node, sensor input, actuator output, and communication link must be considered as potentially vulnerable and a resilient control methodology must be developed to accommodate malicious modifications, failures, and malfunctions of any subsets of the overall set of these components. Within a distributed control system, this requires that at each computational node, each incoming sensor/information message must be considered as potentially incorrect/malicious, each outgoing actuator command or information message must be considered as potentially vulnerable to not being received at the intended destination or that the destination node/component has been compromised, and that each of the other nodes that it is in communication with could be potentially compromised. There have been several guidelines and best practices for ICS security and management against attacks [11], [12].

Hence, to address the cyber-resiliency needs as described above under a certain class of attacks on sensor-actuator information links (as described further below), sensor-actuator-communication structural concepts and distributed control system design and implementation techniques are developed in this paper that can ensure robust performance under attack/failure scenarios. The specific problem considered in this paper is described in Section II along with an overview of the structure of the paper.

II. Motivation and Overview

As described in Section I, current-day real world systems often inherently are of a distributed control structure rather than the classical paradigm of centralized decision-making. A distributed structure is often needed due to multiple types of constraints/requirements such as communication-related constraints, requirements for fault tolerance and resiliency, security-related considerations, etc. Due to the distributed nature of the sensing-actuation capabilities of ICS, there typically exist a multitude of decision-makers. Therefore, the crafted communication structures need to take into account that only partial data may be accessed by the decision-makers, while guaranteeing that a desired closed-loop control performance is achievable. Some groundbreaking work in the understanding of necessary and sufficient conditions to ensure arbitrary spectrum placement of closed-loop systems constrained to specified information

patterns can be found in [1], [13]–[15]. In recent years, research in decentralized control has seen several advances that contributed to a renewed interest in the field [16]–[22].

In this paper, our aim is to develop a methodology to design a sensor-actuator pairing structure and a corresponding control algorithm that together guarantee that the closed-loop system attains a given performance under disruptive scenarios such as natural failures or attacks by a malicious agent on actuators, sensors, or communication components of the system. The proposed design methodology is based on a novel formulation of resilient fixed modes of an interconnected system to provide a tool for both analysis of the structural properties of the system and architecture design of an interconnected system for enhanced resiliency against attacks/failures.

To conceptually illustrate the problem addressed here, consider the multi-input-multi-output (MIMO) dynamic process shown in Figure 1. As conceptually illustrated in Figure 1, a feedback loop in the MIMO system can be thought of as a link between a sensor (or more generally a set of sensors) and an actuator (or more generally a set of actuators) through a computation node (an implementation of a controller). Given a system, one aspect of the problem considered here is to determine the structure of sensor locations (i.e., state dependencies of sensor measurements), actuator locations (i.e., state variables directly controlled), and communication between sensors and actuators so as to provide certain resiliency properties of the resulting closed-loop system. In particular, the resiliency properties are formulated (as defined in more detail in Section III) as certain guarantees on closed-loop system behavior under any of a set of possible attacks on the feedback interconnections.



Fig. 1: closed-loop feedback structure in an ICS and illustration of the various possible attack locations. The proposed methodology addresses a general MIMO system with multiple distributed feedback controllers; the figure shows one feedback link for simplicity.

The threat model considered here is the disabling of a subset of actuators, sensors, and sensor-actuator

feedback links in a distributed control system. In a control system context, this class of attacks can be modeled as zeroing out specific "attacked" elements of the closed-loop feedback gain matrix. As illustrated in Figure 1, such an attack on a feedback link could result from an attack on a sensor (e.g., physical tampering with a sensor, attack on the communication interface to the sensor), an attack on a computational node (e.g., attack on a PLC or other computer utilized to implement a control algorithm), or an attack on an actuator (e.g., physical tampering with an actuator, attack on the communication interface to the actuator). From a control system viewpoint, any such attack results in loss of that sensor-actuator feedback interconnection. Hence, to achieve resiliency against such attacks, the design methodology proposed in this paper seeks to guarantee certain closed-loop system properties regardless of attack/non-attack conditions. Furthermore, we propose a methodology to find the minimum structure of sensors, actuators, and communication links so as to achieve the desired resiliency properties.

Several necessary and sufficient conditions that characterize the structural controllability, as well as their verification, are known for linear time-invariant [23], and switching systems [24]. Nevertheless, the design of actuation capabilities to ensure that these conditions hold has only been addressed in the last few years [25]–[31]. In particular, the problem of determining the minimum number of actuated variables ensuring structural controllability in LTI systems was addressed in [27], [29], and later extended to the case when cost constraints on the actuated state variables are imposed [28]. Further, when the actuation capabilities are known a priori, and the minimum subset of these is sought to ensure structural controllability, the problem was shown to be NP-hard in [31]. More recently, the problem of determining the minimum number of actuated variables ensuring structural controllability was extended for discrete-time fractional dynamics [32] and linear time-invariant switching systems [33].

Further, it was shown in [30] that determining the minimum actuation-sensing-communication required to ensure the existence of decentralized control laws in a generic (i.e., using structural systems) was shown to be NP-hard. Nonetheless, any of the mentioned results address the design of secured/resilient closed-loop systems, as we propose in the current manuscript. Yet, it is worth to mentione that the design of robust actuation/sensing configurations has been previously addressed and shown to be NP-hard [34]; more specifically, when the goal is to determine the minimum number of state variables actuated such that the system is structurally controllable an actuator failure. Hereafter, we leverage the insights gained in previous works to obtain a systematic framework that can be performed in polynomial-time under some mild assumptions – discussed in detail in Section V. Similarly, the feasible minimal communication-pairings between sensors and actuators allowing decentralized control laws, i.e., essential information patterns, were studied in detail in [35], and showed to be an NP-hard. Finally, in [36] the p-robustness of the power grid was analyzed with respect to transmission line failures; in other words,

we determined the number of failures that can occur while guaranteeing generic controllability of the associated dynamical system.

The main contributions of this paper are fourfold: (i) introduction of the notion of resilient fixed-modes free system that ensures the non-existence of fixed modes when the actuation-sensing-communication structure is compromised; (ii) a graph-theoretical representation that ensures almost always the non-existence of resilient fixed modes; (iii) a solution to the problem of designing the minimum actuation-sensing-communication structure that ensures a system without resilient fixed modes almost always; and (iv) determine, for a parametrized system, the gain satisfying the sparsity of a given information pattern by resorting to convex optimization tools.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section III, we provide the formal problem statement. Section IV reviews some concepts and introduces results in structural systems theory and computational complexity. Subsequently, in Section V, we present the main technical results, followed by an illustrative example in Section VII. Conclusions and discussions on further research are presented in Section VIII.

III. Problem Formulation

Several systems, besides producing data for analysis, exhibit dynamic properties that permit forecasting of its evolution. For instance, any process described by a time-series, or transition between states as prescribed by a Markov chain, can be modeled as a linear time-invariant (LTI) system. In addition, other common processes considered in distributed computing, such as consensus-like algorithms, can also be expressed by LTI systems. Therefore, before we state the problem statement addressed in this paper, we review the formalism to describe LTI systems in Section III-A. In Section III-B, we introduce the required concepts for the analysis and design of systems when only partial information is available for control, i.e., decentralized control. Next, in Section III-C we introduce graph-theoretical concepts and tools that will be utilized to achieve decentralized control. In Section III-D, we introduce the formal problem statements addressed in this paper.

A. Model and Dynamics

Let the state of the system $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ evolve over discrete time k as follows:

$$x[k+1] = Ax[k]. \tag{1}$$

The system described in (1) is referred to as *autonomous*. Subsequently, such systems have to be actuated and sensed:

$$x[k+1] = Ax[k] + Bu[k], \quad y[k] = Cx[k], \tag{2}$$

where $u \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the input vector collecting the control signals and $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are the output vector collecting the measurements. Therefore, an actuator, by directly adjusting only a few state variables can tune the overall behavior of the system through its dynamics. Notice that these actuators are commonly devices, whose input is determined algorithmically in some locally available computational unit. Similarly, in order to keep track of the system's state evolution, several measurements are collected across the physical system, which is commonly geographically distributed. Again, these measurements can be sensed by physical devices or inferred by some methodology utilizing locally available computational capabilities.

Further, to reduce computational requirements, we may want the actuator commands to be linear combinations of observed measurements, which leads to efficient control strategies. Subsequently, assume that the input is given by:

$$u[k] = Ky[k] = KCx[k], \tag{3}$$

hence, the *closed-loop control system* (2) using static output feedback (3) is described as follows:

$$x[k+1] = (A + BKC)x[k]. \tag{4}$$

However, the data collected in the sensors is not always available to all actuators, which implies that the matrix K may have some zeros, i.e., it is not a full matrix. To formalize these notions, which are the core of decentralized control, we need to account for the *information patterns*, i.e., the sparsity of the *gain* matrix K, given by a binary matrix $\bar{K} \in \{0,1\}^{p\times m}$, where $\bar{K}_{i,j} = 1$ if the measurements from sensor j are available by actuator i, and zero otherwise. Notice that these patterns induce the sparsity on the static output feedback gains $K \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times m}$ in (3)-(4).

For notational convenience, we refer to (4) by the tuple (A, B, C, K), and we identify the system in (2) with the tuple (A, B, C).

Remark 1: For simplicity in illustrating the primary concepts introduced in this paper, the closed-loop system is formulated above as comprising of a LTI dynamic system and a static output feedback controller. Observe that the basic proposed design concepts can be extended to address time-varying systems as well as dynamic controllers that include an observer to estimate unmeasured parts of the state instead of simply constructing a feedback as a static gain applied to measured outputs. The formulation described here can directly address several practically realistic ICS in various application domains such as power grid, manufacturing, and chemical systems. Furthermore, dynamical systems in several applications with slowly time-varying dynamics can be approximated as LTI systems making the formulation here directly applicable to such systems as well. Also, controllers based on proportional-integral-derivative (PID) structure that is very popular in ICS applications can be directly addressed in the formulation here by a suitable augmentation of the system state vector. $\diamond$

B. Decentralized Control

In static output feedback, a *feasible* information pattern $\bar{K}$ is one that ensures that the closed-loop system has no *fixed modes* [13], i.e., fixed eigenvalues of the closed-loop matrix $(A + BKC)$ upon different realizations of the gain with a specified information pattern. Formally, given a matrix $\bar{M} \in \{0,1\}^{m\times n}$, denote by $[\bar{M}]$, the set $\{M \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n} : M_{i,j} = 0 \text{ if } \bar{M}_{ij} = 0\}$. The set of fixed modes of the closed-loop system (2) w.r.t. the information pattern $\bar{K}$ is given by $\sigma_{\bar{K}} = \bigcap_{K\in[\bar{K}]} \sigma(A + BKC)$ (see [13]), where $\sigma(M)$ denotes the set of eigenvalues of the matrix M. It is known that if $\sigma_{\bar{K}} \subset \mathcal{W}$, for a non-empty open set $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathbb{C}$, which is symmetric about the real line, then there exists a gain $K \in [\bar{K}]$ such that all the eigenvalues of the closed-loop system matrix $A + BKC$ are in $\mathcal{W}$.

Remark 2: The concept of information patterns is utilized here to indicate which sensor-actuator feedback links are possible in the closed-loop system. Hence, if the $(i,j)^{th}$ entry of $\bar{K}$ is 1, this indicates that the control command to the i^{th} actuator can utilize the data from the j^{th} sensor. In the context of Figure 1, this can be visualized as the possibility that the closed-loop system can contain a computational node that takes as input the reading from sensor j and provides as output the command to actuator i. Through its entries (0 or 1), the information pattern matrix $\bar{K}$ specifies which sensor measurements are available to each of the computational nodes that calculate the commands to each of the actuators. ◇

C. Structural Systems

In many practical scenarios, in particular in large-scale systems, it is often the case that the exact values of the non-zero parameters of the plant matrices are unknown, or that these may change over time. To address this problem, in this paper, we adopt the framework of structural systems [23]. To this end, let $\bar{A} \in \{0,1\}^{n\times n}$, $\bar{B} \in \{0,1\}^{n\times p}$ and $\bar{C} \in \{0,1\}^{n\times m}$ be the binary matrices that represent the structural patterns (location of zeros and non-zeros) of A, B, and C, respectively. We then focus on properties of systems, where the plant matrices have these sparsity patterns $(\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{C})$ which we refer to as a *structural system*.

Hereafter, we consider the notion of structural fixed modes introduced in [37], which, essentially, are the fixed modes attributed to the structural pattern of a system, as opposed to those that originate from the canceling of numerical parameters. More concretely, a structural LTI system $(\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{C})$ is said to have structurally fixed modes (SFMs) w.r.t. an information pattern $\bar{K}$, which we refer to as $(\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{K}, \bar{C})$ has no structurally fixed modes, if for all $A \in [\bar{A}]$, $B \in [\bar{B}]$, $C \in [\bar{C}]$, we have $\bigcap_{K\in[\bar{K}]} \sigma(A + BKC) \neq \emptyset$.

Conversely, a structural system $(\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{K}, \bar{C})$ has no structurally fixed modes, if there exists at least one instantiation $A \in [\bar{A}]$, $B \in [\bar{B}]$, $C \in [\bar{C}]$ which has no fixed modes (i.e., $\cap_{K\in[\bar{K}]}\sigma(A+BKC) = \emptyset$).

In this latter case, it may be shown (see [38]) that almost all systems in the sparsity class $(\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{K}, \bar{C})$ have no fixed modes, and, hence, allow pole placement arbitrarily close to any pre-specified (symmetrical about the real axis) set of eigenvalues by a static output feedback with the sparsity of $\bar{K}$. Note that by enabling the closed-loop poles to be assigned arbitrarily, we can ensure stability of the system and also, by appropriate choice of the closed-loop pole locations, specify certain performance aspects of the closed-loop system behavior. For example, how fast the system achieves the equilibrium or attenuates the disturbance.

D. Problem Statements

Now, suppose that a natural failure or an attack to the actuator-sensor-communuication structure occurs. Then, we need to introduce the notion of *robust information patterns*, and the corresponding notion of the existence of decentralized control strategies. Subsequently, we introduce the notion of *resilient fixed modes* that are a natural extension of fixed modes, when accounting for communication failures, or, equivalentely, actuators and sensor failures as explained in Section II.

Definition 1: Consider system (2)-(3) with p actuators and m sensors, $\mathcal{K}$ the set of possible communication links from the sensors to the actuators, and $\{\Gamma_i\}_{i\in\Delta}$ the collection of possible communication failures, with $\Gamma_i \subset \mathcal{K}$ for all $i \in \Delta$. The set

$$\Sigma(A, B, C; \mathcal{K}, \{\Gamma_i\}_{i\in\Delta}) = \bigcup_{i\in\Delta} \bigcap_{K\in[\bar{K}(\mathcal{K})]_{p,m}^{\Gamma_i}} \sigma(A + BKC)$$

is defined to be the set of *resilient* fixed modes under a collection of feedback failures $\{\Gamma_i\}_{i\in\Delta}$ of the closed-loop system (4) with respect to the information pattern $\bar{K}(\mathcal{K})$, where $K_{i,j} = 1$ if $(j, i) \in \mathcal{K}$ and zero otherwise, and $[\bar{K}(\mathcal{K})]_{p,m}^{\Gamma_i}$ is the set of all possible $p \times m$ constant output feedback matrices given by $[\bar{K}(\mathcal{K})]_{p,m}^{\Gamma_i} = \{K \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times m} :\ K_{lk} = 0 \text{ if } (k, l) \notin \mathcal{K} \text{ or } (k, l) \in \Gamma_i,\ 0 \le l \le p,\ 0 \le k \le m\}$. ⋄

Similar to the structural counterpart of fixed modes, we introduce the concept of *structurally resilient fixed modes* defined as follows.

Definition 2: Consider system (2)-(3) with p actuators and m sensors, and denote its structural pattern by $(\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{C}; \mathcal{K}, \{\Gamma_i\}_{i\in\Delta})$, where $\mathcal{K}$ is the set of possible communication links from the sensors to the actuators, and $\{\Gamma_i\}_{i\in\Delta}$ the collection of possible communication failures, with $\Gamma_i \subset \mathcal{K}$ for all $i \in \Delta$. Then, $(\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{C}; \mathcal{K}, \{\Gamma_i\}_{i\in\Delta})$ is said to have structurally resilient fixed modes w.r.t. an information pattern $\bar{K}(\mathcal{K})$, where $K_{i,j} = 1$ if $(j, i) \in \mathcal{K}$ and zero otherwise, if for all $A \in [\bar{A}]_{n\times n}$, $B \in [\bar{B}]_{n\times p}$, $C \in [\bar{C}]_{m\times n}$, we have $\Sigma(A, B, C; \mathcal{K}, \{\Gamma_i\}_{i\in\Delta}) \neq \emptyset$. ⋄

Hereafter, we focus on the *analysis* and *design* of secured/resilient closed-loop control systems. Therefore, the first problem we address can be states as follows:

$\mathcal{P}_\mathbf{1}$: Provide necessary and sufficient conditions to ensure that a system has no structurally resilient fixed modes w.r.t. an information pattern and a collection of possible communication failures. ◦

Then, with these conditions, we aim to design *secured/resilient* large-scale closed-loop control systems. More precisely, suppose that only the structure of the autonomous system is known, i.e., $\bar{A}$ associated with (1). Then, the goal is to determine the location of *dedicated* actuators and sensors (i.e., that only actuate and measure a single state variable, respectively), as well as the communication between these, such that the system has no structurally resilient fixed modes w.r.t. the information pattern induced by the chosen communication links and any set of possible actuator-sensor-communication failures containing at most k elements. In other words, given $\bar{A}$, we want to determine $(\bar{B}(\mathcal{I}_B), \bar{C}(\mathcal{I}_C), \bar{K}(\mathcal{K}))$, where $\bar{B}$ (respectively, $\bar{C}$) contain columns (respectively, rows) with at most one nonzero entry in each column (respectively, row) indexed by the elements in the collection $\mathcal{I}_B \equiv \{\iota_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ with $\iota_i \in \{1, \cdots, n\}$ (respectively, $\mathcal{I}_C \equiv \{\iota_j\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}}$), and $K_{i,j} = 1$ if $(j, i) \in \mathcal{K}$ and zero otherwise. Notice that, in particular, $\mathcal{I}_B$ and $\mathcal{I}_C$ may contain several times the same index, which corresponds to the case where the same state variable is actuated and measured by different actuators and sensors, respectively. Yet, $\mathcal{K}$ does not contain twice the same pair of indices since these correspond uniquely to a sensor-actuator pair, and multiple simultaneous communications between the sensor and actuator in the pair are not allowed. In summary, we have the following problem:

$\mathcal{P}_\mathbf{2}$: Given $\bar{A}$, and a maximum of k actuator-sensor-communication failures, we want to determine $(\bar{B}(\mathcal{I}_B^*), \bar{C}(\mathcal{I}_C^*), \bar{K}(\mathcal{K}^*))$, where $(\mathcal{I}_B^*, \mathcal{I}_C^*, \mathcal{K}^*)$ is a solution to the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathcal{I}_B, \mathcal{I}_C, \mathcal{K}} \quad & |\mathcal{I}_B| + |\mathcal{I}_C| + |\mathcal{K}| \\ \text{s. t.} \quad & (\bar{A}, \bar{B}(\mathcal{I}_B \setminus \mathcal{J}_B), \bar{C}(\mathcal{I}_C \setminus \mathcal{J}_C); \mathcal{K}, \mathcal{J}) \text{ has no struct.} \\ & \text{resilient fixed modes, for all } \mathcal{J} \subset \mathcal{K}, \mathcal{J}_B \subset \mathcal{I}_B, \\ & \mathcal{J}_C \subset \mathcal{I}_C, \text{ and } |\mathcal{J}| \leq k, |\mathcal{J}_B| \leq k, \ |\mathcal{J}_C| \leq k, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where $|\mathcal{I}_B|$ and $|\mathcal{I}_C|$ are the number of dedicated actuators and sensors, respectively, i.e., the number of elements in the collections $\mathcal{I}_B$ and $\mathcal{I}_C$, and $|\mathcal{K}|$ are the number of communication links from the sensors to the actuators to obtain the decentralized closed-loop control system. ◦

Remark 3: In the formulation of robust information patterns and structurally resilient fixed modes above, the possible variability of the system structure (due to attacks) is modeled through the set of possible attacks Γ_i. Each Γ_i is a set of sensor-actuator communication links (i.e., a subset of $\mathcal{K}$, which is the set of all possible sensor-actuator communication links in the system) that are lost under that particular attack. As described in Section II, the loss of a sensor-actuator link can result from multiple types of attacks (including sensor attacks, actuator attacks, communication attacks, computa-

tion node attacks, etc.), and physically corresponds to loss of the particular sensor-actuator feedback interconnection. As described above, the proposed methodology addresses the ensuring of stability and performance properties of the closed-loop system under any possible resulting information pattern (under the normal unattacked system operation and under any of the set of considered attacks). Note that the resulting information pattern under an attack condition is essentially a subset of the information pattern $\bar{K}$ formed by constraining to 0 the elements corresponding to the sensor-actuator communication links disabled under the particular attack. By ensuring that the system does not have any structurally resilient fixed modes, it is guaranteed that under any resulting information pattern, all the closed-loop system eigenvalues can be arbitrarily placed by choosing the feedback gain appropriately. In many ICS applications, it is only required to ensure placing of open-loop unstable eigenvalues (i.e., not required to ensure placing of *all* the eigenvalues); this corresponds to the unstable resilient fixed modes free concept that is considered in Section V-B. $\diamond$

IV. Preliminaries and terminology

Consider an LTI system (2)-(4). In order to perform structural analysis efficiently, it is customary to associate to (2) a directed graph (digraph) $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, in which $\mathcal{V}$ denotes the set of *vertices* and $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ the set of *edges*, where (v_j, v_i) represents an edge from the vertex v_j to vertex v_i. To this end, let $\bar{A} \in \{0,1\}^{n\times n}$, $\bar{B} \in \{0,1\}^{n\times p}$ and $\bar{C} \in \{0,1\}^{m\times n}$ be binary matrices that represent the sparsity patterns of A, B and C respectively. Denote by $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$, $\mathcal{U} = \{u_1, \ldots, u_p\}$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \{y_1, \ldots, y_m\}$ the sets of state, input and output vertices, respectively. And by $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}} = \{(x_i, x_j) : \bar{A}_{ji} \neq 0\}$, $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{U},\mathcal{X}} = \{(u_j, x_i) : \bar{B}_{ij} \neq 0\}$, and $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}} = \{(x_i, y_j) : \bar{C}_{ji} \neq 0\}$ the edges between the sets in subscript; further, given an *information pattern* $\bar{K} \in \{0,1\}^{p\times m}$, describing output feedback in the inputs, we also have $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{U}} = \{(y_j, u_i) : \bar{K}_{ij} \neq 0\}$. In addition, we introduce *state* digraph $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}) = (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}})$, the *system* digraph $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{C}) = (\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}} \cup \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{U},\mathcal{X}} \cup \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}})$, and the *closed-loop system* digraph $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{C}, \bar{K}) = (\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}} \cup \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{U},\mathcal{X}} \cup \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}} \cup \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{U}})$.

A *directed path* between the vertices v_1 and v_k is a sequence of edges $\{(v_1, v_2), (v_2, v_3), \ldots, (v_{k-1}, v_k)\}$. If all the vertices in a directed path are different, then the path is said to be an *elementary path*. A *cycle* is an elementary path from v_1 to v_k, together with an edge from v_k to v_1.

We also require the following graph-theoretic notions [39]: A digraph is strongly connected if there exists a directed path between any two vertices. A *strongly connected component* (SCC) is a maximal subgraph $\mathcal{D}_S = (\mathcal{V}_S, \mathcal{E}_S)$ of $\mathcal{D}$, i.e., a graph comprising a set of vertices $\mathcal{V}' \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ and of edges $\mathcal{E}' \subseteq \mathcal{E}$, such that for every $u, v \in \mathcal{V}_S$ there exist paths from u to v and is maximal with this property (i.e., considering any other vertex will make the subgraph cease to be strongly connected).

Since the SCCs of a digraph $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ are uniquely determined, we can regard each SCC as a



Fig. 2: In (a) we have depicted a digraph $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A})$. The SCCs are depicted within the dashed boxes; the digraph comprises two non-top linked SCCs $(\mathcal{N}_1^T, \mathcal{N}_2^T)$ and two non-bottom linked SCCs $(\mathcal{N}_1^B, \mathcal{N}_2^B)$. In (b), we depicted the state bipartite graph $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A}) \equiv \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}})$. We further depicted two matchings M comprising the edges in red, and M' comprising the blue edges; both of which are also highlighted in (a). It can be seen that neither of these matchings is a *maximum matching*, but their union M^* is. In addition, notice that the maximum matching has a connection with a decomposition of the state digraph in paths and cycles, as stated in Lemma 3.

virtual node. By doing so, we build a *directed acyclic graph* (DAG), i.e., a directed graph with no cycles, in which a directed edge exists between two virtual nodes representing two SCCs *if and only if* there exists an edge between two vertices in the corresponding SCCs in the original digraph. We call this the DAG representation of the graph, which can be computed efficiently in $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{V}| + |\mathcal{E}|)$ [39]. We can further classify the SCCs with respect to the existence of incoming and/or outgoing edges as follows.

Definition 3 ([27]): An SCC is said to be linked if it has at least one incoming or outgoing edge from another SCC. In particular, an SCC is *non-top linked* if it has no incoming edges from another SCC, and *non-bottom linked* if it has no outgoing edges to another SCC. $\diamond$

For any digraph $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ and any two vertex sets $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2 \subset \mathcal{V}$, we define the *bipartite graph* $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}_1,\mathcal{S}_2})$ whose vertex set is given by $\mathcal{S}_1 \cup \mathcal{S}_2$ (where $\mathcal{S}_1$ and $\mathcal{S}_2$ are assumed to be disjoint) and the edge set $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}_1,\mathcal{S}_2} = \mathcal{E} \cap (\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2)$. We call the bipartite graph $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ the bipartite graph associated with $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$. In the sequel, we will make heavy use of the *state bipartite graph* $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A}) \equiv \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}})$, which is the bipartite graph associated with the state digraph $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}) = (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}})$. An illustration of a state bipartite graph can be found in Figure $2-(b)$ associated with the state digraphs in Figure $2-(a)$.

Given $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}_1,\mathcal{S}_2})$, a matching M corresponds to a subset of edges in $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}_1,\mathcal{S}_2}$ so that no two edges have a vertex in common, (i.e., given edges $e = (s_1, s_2)$ and $e' = (s_1', s_2')$ with $s_1, s_1' \in \mathcal{S}_1$ and $s_2, s_2' \in \mathcal{S}_2$, $e, e' \in M$ only if $s_1 \neq s_1'$ and $s_2 \neq s_2'$). An example of a matching can be found in

Figure $2-(b)$. A maximum matching M^* is a matching M that has the largest number of edges among all possible matchings, compare the matching M with M^* in Figure $2-(b)$.

We call the vertices in $\mathcal{S}_1$ and $\mathcal{S}_2$ belonging to an edge in M^*, the *matched vertices* with respect to (w.r.t.) M^*, and *unmatched vertices* otherwise. Note that in general maximum matchings are not unique, for example, in Figure $2-(b)$ replacing the edge (x_8, x_9) in M^* with (x_9, x_9) yields a different maximum matching. For ease of referencing, in the sequel, the term *right-unmatched vertices* associated with the matching M of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{S}_1,\mathcal{S}_2})$ (not necessarily maximum), will refer to those vertices in $\mathcal{S}_2$ that do not belong to a matching edge in M^*, dually a vertex from $\mathcal{S}_1$ that does not belong to an edge in M^* is called a *left-unmatched vertex*.

Given a state digraph $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}) = (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}})$, a particular bipartite graph of interest is its bipartite representation denoted as $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A}) \equiv \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}})$, and we refer to it as the *state bipartite graph*. The state bipartite graph may be used to characterize all possible structurally controllable pairs $(\bar{A}, \bar{B})$, see [27]. In particular, in the sequel, we will use the following result.

Proposition 1 ([27]): Given $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}) = (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}})$ and its DAG representation, constituted by k SCCs, denoted by $\{\mathcal{N}_i\}_{i=1}^k$, where $\mathcal{N}_i = (\mathcal{X}_i, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X}_i,\mathcal{X}_i})$, let $\mathcal{N}_{i_1}, \ldots \mathcal{N}_{i_m}$ be the non-top linked SCCs in the DAG representation with $\{i_1, \ldots, i_m\} \subset \{1, \ldots, k\}$ and $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$ the state bipartite graph. If $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$ has a perfect matching, then $(\bar{A}, \bar{B})$ is structurally controllable if and only if for each non-top linked SCC there exists an input (corresponding to a column in $\bar{B}$) assigned to, i.e., connected to, at least one of its state variables. $\diamond$

Now, to assess if a system has structural fixed modes (introduced in Section III), we will make use of the following graph-theoretic conditions that ensure the absence of structurally fixed modes.

Theorem 1 ([40]): The structural system $(\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{K}, \bar{C})$ associated with (4) has no structurally fixed modes, if and only if both of the following conditions hold:

- (a) in $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{K}, \bar{C}) = (\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}} \cup \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}} \cup \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{U},\mathcal{X}} \cup \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{U}})$, each state vertex $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is contained in an SCC which includes an edge of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{U}}$;
- (b) there exists a finite disjoint union of cycles $\mathcal{C}_k = (\mathcal{V}_k, \mathcal{E}_k)$ (subgraph of $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{K}, \bar{C})$) with $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{X} \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^k \mathcal{V}_j$. $\diamond$

The second condition from Theorem 1 ensures that the system does not have any fixed modes at zero [41]. Although such modes are a concern for continuous-time systems, they are not an issue for stabilization of discrete-time plants, because fixed modes at zero are stable. Thus, we have the following result.

Corollary 1 ([41]): The structural system $(\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{C})$ associated with (2) has no structurally fixed modes (other than at the origin) w.r.t. an information pattern $\bar{K}$, if and only if in $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{K}, \bar{C}) =$

$(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}} \cup \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}} \cup \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{U},\mathcal{X}} \cup \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{U}})$, each state vertex $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is contained in an SCC which includes an edge of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{U}}$. $\diamond$

In addition, a pair $(\bar{A}, \bar{B})$ is said to be structurally controllable if there exists a pair (A', B') with the same structure as $(\bar{A}, \bar{B})$, i.e., same locations of zeros and nonzeros, such that (A', B') is controllable. By density arguments [42], it can be shown that if a pair $(\bar{A}, \bar{B})$ is structurally controllable, then almost all (with respect to the Lebesgue measure) pairs with the same structure as $(\bar{A}, \bar{B})$ are controllable. In essence, structural controllability is a property of the structure of the pair $(\bar{A}, \bar{B})$ and not of the specific numerical values. A similar definition and characterization holds for structural observability (with obvious modifications) of the pair $(\bar{A}, \bar{C})$. Further, if a closed-loop system has no structurally fixed modes with respect to an information pattern, then the system digraph has to be structurally controllable and observable.

Lemma 1 ([27]): The structural system $(\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{K}, \bar{C})$ associated with (4) has no structurally fixed modes, if and only if $(\bar{A}, \bar{B})$ and $(\bar{A}, \bar{C})$ is structurally controllable and observable, respectively. $\diamond$

A similar result to that in Lemma 1, when the system is required to only be stabilizable, is as follows.

Lemma 2 ([41]): The structural system $(\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{K}, \bar{C})$ associated with (4) has no structurally fixed modes (other than at the origin) w.r.t. an information pattern $\bar{K}$, if and only if for every state vertex belongs to a directed path that starts and ends in an input vertex and ends in an output vertex, respectively. $\diamond$

The next result allow us to interpret a maximum matching of the state bipartite graph in terms of a representation in the state digraph.

Lemma 3 ([27]): Consider the digraph $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}) = (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}})$ and let M^* be a maximum matching associated with the bipartite graph $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}})$. Then, the digraph $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{X}, M^*)$ comprises a disjoint union of cycles and elementary paths (by definition an isolated vertex is regarded as an elementary path with no edges), from the right-unmatched vertices to the left-unmatched vertices of M^*, that span $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A})$. Moreover, such a decomposition is *minimal*, in the sense that no other spanning subgraph decomposition of $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A})$ into elementary paths and cycles contains strictly fewer elementary paths. $\diamond$

In addition, we need to introduce the following definitions that allows the characterization of fixed modes free systems.

We thus begin by defining index- and sequential-pairing, that will be used throughout the remainder of the paper in order to describe how the communication from a set of sensors $\mathcal{J}$ to a set of actuators $\mathcal{I}$ should be setup.

Definition 4 (Index-pairing): Given two sets of indices $\mathcal{I} = \{i_1, \ldots, i_n\}$ and $\mathcal{J} = \{j_1, \ldots, j_k\}$, we define an index pairing $\langle \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J} \rangle$ as being a maximum matching of the bipartite graph $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}, \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{J})$. $\diamond$

Definition 5 (Sequential-pairing): Consider two sets of indices $\mathcal{I} = \{i_1, \ldots, i_n\}$ and $\mathcal{J} = \{j_1, \ldots, j_n\}$,

and a maximum matching M of the bipartite graph $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{J},\mathcal{I}})$, where $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{J},\mathcal{I}} \subseteq \mathcal{J} \times \mathcal{I}$. We denote by $|\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}\rangle_M$ a sequential-pairing induced by M, defined as follows:

$$|\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}\rangle_M = \left(\bigcup_{l=2,\ldots,k} \{(i_l, j_{l-1})\} \right) \cup \big\{(i_1, j_k)\big\},$$

where $(i_l, j_l) \in M$, for $l = 1, \ldots, k$. ◇

Remark 4: The sequential-pairing consists in the collection of edges such that $M \cup |\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}\rangle_M$ forms a cycle. ◇

V. Main results

In this section, we present the main results of this paper. We first address the problem $\mathcal{P}_1$ in its full generality. Then, in Section V-A we address the design problem proposed in $\mathcal{P}_2$ under a mild assumption (formally stated in **A1**) that will simplify the technical procedure making the combinatorial problem solvable in polynomial-time. This assumption englobes a practically relevant class of systems since it subsumes the following scenarios: (i) all dynamical systems modeled as random networks of the Erdős-Rényi type [43]; (ii) discretized dynamical systems using Euler discretization for almost all discretization steps; (iii) several dynamical systems as presented in [2], [3]. Subsequently, in Section V-B we show that the proposed design holds generically for arbitrary systems, i.e., not only those under the restriction **A1**, if instead of ensuring arbitrary pole placement, we seek to ensure that the system is stabilizable, i.e., all the eigenvalues of the closed-loop system lie within the unitary circle in the complex plane. Finally, in Section V-C we provide a discussion of the main results; in particular, we explore the following variations of $\mathcal{P}_2$: (i) when actuators and sensors, not necessarily dedicated, are chosen from a list of possible actuators and sensors; and (ii) we allow the actuators and sensors to control and measure an arbitrary linear combination of state variables, respectively.

We start by addressing $\mathcal{P}_1$, i.e., providing necessary and sufficient conditions for secured decentralized closed-loop systems.

Theorem 2: The structural system $(\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{C}; \mathcal{K}, \{\Gamma_i\}_{i\in\Delta})$ associated with (4) has no resilient structurally fixed modes if and only if both of the following conditions hold for all $i \in \Delta$:

- (a) in $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{C}; \mathcal{K}, \Gamma_i) = (\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}} \cup \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}} \cup \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{U},\mathcal{X}} \cup (\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{U}} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i}))$, with $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i} = \{(y_i, u_j) : (j, i) \in \Gamma_i\}$, each state vertex $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is contained in an SCC which includes an edge of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{U}} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i}$;
- (b) there exists a finite disjoint union of cycles $\mathcal{C}_k = (\mathcal{V}_k, \mathcal{E}_k)$ (subgraph of $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{C}; \mathcal{K}, \Gamma_i)$) with $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{X} \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{k} \mathcal{V}_j$. ◇

Now, we notice that the second condition from Theorem 1 ensures that the system does not have any fixed modes at zero, which implies that to obtain stabilizability the following result holds.

Corollary 2: The structural system $(\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{C}; \mathcal{K}, \{\Gamma_i\}_{i\in\Delta})$ has no structurally fixed modes (other than at the origin) if and only if in $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{C}; \mathcal{K}, \Gamma_i) = (\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}} \cup \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}} \cup \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{U},\mathcal{X}} \cup (\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{U}} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i}))$ for all $i \in \Delta$, with $\mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i} = \{(y_i, u_j) : (j, i) \in \Gamma_i\}$, each state vertex $x \in \mathcal{X}$ is contained in an SCC which includes an edge of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{U}} \setminus \mathcal{E}_{\Gamma_i}$. ◇

A. Design of Resilient Fixed Modes Free Closed-loop Systems

In this section, we address $\mathcal{P}_2$ under the following (mild) assumption:

A1 The structural dynamic matrix $\bar{A}$ is such that the state bipartite graph $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A}) = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}})$ associated with $\bar{A}$, has a perfect matching. In other words, $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A})$ is spanned by a disjoint union of cycles (see Lemma 3). ◇

Now, we consider the minimum actuation-sensing capabilities, and describe how to determine the sparsest information pattern that ensures the closed-loop system has no structurally resilient fixed modes. Towards this goal, we first consider the following procedure.

Procedure 1: Consider $\mathcal{I}_B^*$ and $\mathcal{I}_C^*$ to be the minimum collections of state variables' indices associated with dedicated actuators and sensors, respectively, such that the pair $(\bar{A}, \bar{B}(\mathcal{I}_B^*))$ and $(\bar{A}, \bar{C}(\mathcal{I}_C^*))$ is structurally controllable and observable, respectively. Further, without loss of generality, assume that $|\mathcal{I}_B^*| \leq |\mathcal{I}_C^*|$, with $\mathcal{I}_B = \{1, \ldots, |\mathcal{I}_B^*|\}$ and $\mathcal{I}_C = \{1, \ldots, |\mathcal{I}_C^*|\}$ the sets of indices numbering the dedicated inputs and outputs, respectively. Further, define the bipartite graph $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{I}_B, \mathcal{I}_C, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{I}_B,\mathcal{I}_C})$ having an edge $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{I}_B,\mathcal{I}_C}$ if there is a path from dedicated actuator $i \in \mathcal{I}_B$ to dedicated sensor $j \in \mathcal{I}_C$ (in which case we say that an actuator *reaches* a sensor, or a sensor is *reached* by an actuator). Therefore, a maximum matching M^* of $\mathcal{B}$ describes the maximum number of actuators that reach an equal number of sensors. Subsequently, by considering an information pattern $\bar{K}(\mathcal{K})$, where $\mathcal{K}$ is given by the sequential-pairing $|\mathcal{I}_B, \mathcal{I}_C\rangle_{M^*}$, it follows that $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{B}(\mathcal{I}_B^*), \bar{C}(\mathcal{I}_C^*), \bar{K}(\mathcal{K}))$ has a single non-top linked SCC that contains all non-top and non-bottom SCCs, with variables controlled and measured by the actuators and sensors, respectively, labelled by the indexes that belong to edges in M^*. Further, it also contains all SCCs that are simultaneously reachable and reach these non-top and non-bottom SCCs.

Intuitively, several SCCs are contracted into a single one with the auxiliary of feedback links, which ensure that the newly created non-top linked SCC satisfies Theorem 1-(a). Nonetheless, $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{B}(\mathcal{I}_B^*), \bar{C}(\mathcal{I}_C^*), \bar{K}(\mathcal{K}))$ still has $|\mathcal{I}_C^*| - |\mathcal{I}_B^*|$ non-bottom linked SCCs, as well as (possibly) additional SCCs that reach these. Therefore, a total of $|\mathcal{I}_C^*| - |\mathcal{I}_B^*|$ additional feedback links, corresponding to the indices of $\mathcal{I}_C$ not present in the edges of M^*, need to be considered. Let $\mathcal{K}'$ correspond to feedback links starting in the dedicated sensors labelled by the former indices, and ending in only one of the dedicated

actuators indexed by $\mathcal{I}_B$. Then, $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{B}(\mathcal{I}_B^*), \bar{C}(\mathcal{I}_C^*), \bar{K}(\mathcal{K} \cup \mathcal{K}'))$, consists in a single SCC with feedback links on it, which implies that the closed-loop digraph readily satisfies Theorem 1-(a). Thus, under the assumption A1, $\bar{K}(\mathcal{K}^*)$ with $\mathcal{K}^* = \mathcal{K} \cup \mathcal{K}'$ is a sparsest information pattern ensuring a closed-loop system without structurally fixed modes. ◦

Theorem 3: Given $(\bar{A}, \bar{B}(\mathcal{I}_B^*), \bar{C}(\mathcal{I}_C^*))$, where $\mathcal{I}_B^*$ and $\mathcal{I}_C^*$ are the minimum collections of state variables ensuring structural controllability and observability, then Procedure 1 originates a sparsest information pattern $\bar{K}(\mathcal{K}^*)$ such that $(\bar{A}, \bar{B}(\mathcal{I}_B^*), \bar{C}(\mathcal{I}_C^*), \bar{K}(\mathcal{K}^*))$ has no structurally fixed modes, under assumption A1. In addition, Procedure 1 can be implemented in polynomial time, more precisely, $\mathcal{O}(\max\{|\mathcal{V}| + |\mathcal{E}|, (|\mathcal{I}_B^*| + |\mathcal{I}_C^*|)^{\frac{5}{2}}\})$, where $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{E}$ are the number of vertices and edges of $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{B}(\mathcal{I}_B^*), \bar{C}(\mathcal{I}_C^*))$, respectively. ◇

Towards the solution of $\mathcal{P}_2$, we can extend Theorem 3 to account for an arbitrary number k of communication failures.

Theorem 4: Given $(\bar{A}, \bar{B}(\mathcal{I}_B^*), \bar{C}(\mathcal{I}_C^*))$, where $\mathcal{I}_B^*$ and $\mathcal{I}_C^*$ are the minimum collections of state variables' indices ensuring structural controllability and observability respectively, and k the maximum number of communication failures, then $\bar{K}(\mathcal{K}^*)$ such that $\mathcal{K}^* = \mathcal{K}^{(1)} \cup \ldots \cup \mathcal{K}^{(k+1)}$, where $\mathcal{K}^{(i)}$ is determined using Procedure 1 and $\mathcal{K}^{(i)} \cap \mathcal{K}^{(j)} = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$, is a sparsest information pattern that ensures $(\bar{A}, \bar{B}(\mathcal{I}_B^*), \bar{C}(\mathcal{I}_C^*), \bar{K}(\mathcal{K}^*))$ to have no structurally fixed modes w.r.t. $\bar{K}(\mathcal{K}^*)$ under assumption A1, and any set of failures indexed by $\mathcal{J} \subset \mathcal{K}^*$, with $|\mathcal{J}| \leq k$. In addition, these can be determined in polynomial time, more precisely, $\mathcal{O}(k \max\{|\mathcal{V}| + |\mathcal{E}|, (|\mathcal{I}_B^*| + |\mathcal{I}_C^*|)^{\frac{5}{2}}\})$, where $|\mathcal{V}|$ and $|\mathcal{E}|$ are the number of vertices and edges of $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{B}(\mathcal{I}_B^*), \bar{C}(\mathcal{I}_C^*))$, respectively. ◇

Remark 5: To ensure that two sparsest information patterns using Procedure 1 are such that $\mathcal{K}^{(i)} \cap \mathcal{K}^{(j)} = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$, one just needs to ensure that the edges in the maximum matching $M^{(i)}$ found to determine $\mathcal{K}^{(i)}$ are not considered when computing $\mathcal{K}^{(j)}$. Therefore, when computing $\mathcal{K}^{(j)}$, instead of the set $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{I}_B, \mathcal{I}_C}$ of the bipartite graph we just need to consider $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{I}_B, \mathcal{I}_C} \setminus \left(\bigcup_{l=1}^{j-1} M^{(l)} \right)$. Hence, the procedure does not increase the computational complexity. ◇

Before we provide a solution to $\mathcal{P}_2$, we need the following lemmas, that accounts for the minimum collections of dedicated actuators and sensors that ensure structural controllability and observability when k failures occur.

Lemma 4: Under assumption **A1**, the pair $(\bar{A}, \bar{B}(\mathcal{I}_B \setminus \mathcal{J}_B))$ is structurally controllable, with $\mathcal{J}_B \subset \mathcal{I}_B$ and $|\mathcal{J}_B| \leq k$ if and only if for each non-top linked SCC of $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A})$ there exists at least $k+1$ indices in $\mathcal{I}_B$ corresponding to its state variables. In particular, the minimum number of dedicated actuators required equals $(k+1)t$, where t is the number of non-top linked SCCs, i.e., exactly $k+1$ actuators controlling state variables in each non-top linked SCC. ◇

Similarly, by duality between controllability and observability in LTI systems [44], we obtain the following result.

Lemma 5: Under assumption **A1**, the pair $(\bar{A}, \bar{C}(\mathcal{I}_C \setminus \mathcal{J}_C))$ is structurally observable, with $\mathcal{J}_C \subset \mathcal{I}_C$ and $|\mathcal{J}_C| \leq k$ if and only if for each non-bottom linked SCC of $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A})$ there exists at least $k+1$ indices in $\mathcal{I}_C$ corresponding to its state variables. In particular, the minimum number of dedicated sensors required equals $(k+1)b$, where b is the number of non-bottom linked SCCs, i.e., exactly $k+1$ sensors measuring state variables in each non-bottom linked SCC. $\diamond$

Finally, a solution to $\mathcal{P}_2$ can be obtained as follows.

Theorem 5: Let $\mathcal{I}_B$ and $\mathcal{I}_C$ be the indices associated minimum collection of dedicated actuators and sensors $\bar{B}(\mathcal{I}_B^*)$ and $\bar{C}(\mathcal{I}_C^*)$, with $\mathcal{I}_B^* = \{\iota_1, \ldots, \iota_{(k+1)p}\}$ and $\mathcal{I}_C^* = \{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{(k+1)m}\}$, and k the maximum number of actuator-sensor-communication failures. In addition, let $\mathcal{I}_B^{(i)}$ and $\mathcal{I}_C^{(i)}$, with $i = 1, \ldots, k+1$, be the indices associated minimum collection of dedicated actuators and sensors $\bar{B}(\{\iota_i, \ldots, \iota_{ip}\})$ and $\bar{C}(\{\gamma_i, \ldots, \gamma_{im}\})$, respectively, where $(\bar{A}, \bar{B}(\{\iota_i, \ldots, \iota_{ip}\}))$ and $(\bar{A}, \bar{C}(\{\gamma_i, \ldots, \gamma_{im}\}))$ are structurally controllable and observable, respectively. Further, let $\mathcal{K}^{(i)}$ be the sparsest information pattern determined with Procedure 1 when the two collections $(\mathcal{I}_B^{(i)}, \mathcal{I}_C^{(i)})$ are considered. Then, under assumption A1, $(\mathcal{I}_B^*, \mathcal{I}_C^*, \mathcal{K}^*)$, where $\mathcal{K}^* = \bigcup_{j=1}^{k+1} \mathcal{K}^{(j)}$ is a solution to $\mathcal{P}_2$.

In addition, a solution to $\mathcal{P}_2$ can be determined in polynomial time, more precisely, $\mathcal{O}(k \max\{|\mathcal{V}| + |\mathcal{E}|, (|\mathcal{I}_B^*| + |\mathcal{I}_C^*|)^{\frac{5}{2}}\})$, where $|\mathcal{V}|$ and $|\mathcal{E}|$ are the number of vertices and edges of $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{B}(\mathcal{I}_B^*), \bar{C}(\mathcal{I}_C^*))$, respectively. $\diamond$

B. Design of Unstable Resilient Fixed Modes Free Closed-loop Systems

In practice, it is often desirable to ensure only stabilizability of the closed-loop system, i.e., fixed modes can exist as long as they are stable. The same readily applies for the resilient structurally fixed modes, when the only structurally fixed modes are those in the origin, which we refer to as structurally stable fixed modes. Therefore, one can waive the assumption stated in **A1**, and obtain similar results to those in Section V-A. In particular, consider the following problem that aims to ensure that $\mathcal{P}_2$ does not have unstable structurally resilient fixed modes.

$\mathcal{P}_2^s$ Given $\bar{A}$, and a maximum of k actuator-sensor-communication failures, we want to determine

$(\bar{B}(\mathcal{I}_B^*), \bar{C}(\mathcal{I}_C^*), \bar{K}(\mathcal{K}^*))$, where $(\mathcal{I}_B^*, \mathcal{I}_C^*, \mathcal{K}^*)$ is a solution to the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathcal{I}_B, \mathcal{I}_C, \mathcal{K}} \quad & |\mathcal{I}_B| + |\mathcal{I}_C| + |\mathcal{K}| \\ \text{s. t.} \quad & (\bar{A}, \bar{B}(\mathcal{I}_B \setminus \mathcal{J}_B), \bar{C}(\mathcal{I}_C \setminus \mathcal{J}_C); \bar{K}, \mathcal{J}) \text{ has no} \\ & \text{struct. unstable resilient fixed modes, for all} \\ & \mathcal{J} \subset \bar{\mathcal{K}}, \mathcal{J}_B \subset \mathcal{I}_B, \mathcal{J}_C \subset \mathcal{I}_C, \text{ and } |\mathcal{J}| \leq k, \\ & |\mathcal{J}_B| \leq k, \ |\mathcal{J}_C| \leq k, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where $|\mathcal{I}_B|$ and $|\mathcal{I}_C|$ are the number of state variables actuated and measured, and $|\mathcal{K}|$ is the number of communication links established from the sensors to the actuators to obtain the decentralized closed-loop control system. ○

Subsequently, as corollary to Theorem 5, using Lemma 2 and Corollary 2, we obtain the following result.

Corollary 3: Let $\mathcal{I}_B$ and $\mathcal{I}_C$, be the indices associated minimum collection of dedicated actuators and sensors $\bar{B}(\mathcal{I}_B^*)$ and $\bar{C}(\mathcal{I}_C^*)$, with $\mathcal{I}_B^* = \{\iota_1, \ldots, \iota_{(k+1)p}\}$ and $\mathcal{I}_C^* = \{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{(k+1)m}\}$, and k the maximum number of actuator-sensor-communication failures. In addition, let $\mathcal{I}_B^{(i)}$ and $\mathcal{I}_C^{(i)}$, with $i = 1, \ldots, k+1$, be the indices associated minimum collection of dedicated actuators and sensors $\bar{B}(\{\iota_i, \ldots, \iota_{ip}\})$ and $\bar{C}(\{\gamma_i, \ldots, \gamma_{im}\})$, where $(\bar{A}, \bar{B}(\{\iota_i, \ldots, \iota_{ip}\}))$ and $(\bar{A}, \bar{C}(\{\gamma_i, \ldots, \gamma_{im}\}))$ are structurally controllable and observable, respectively. Further, let $\mathcal{K}^{(i)}$ be the sparsest information pattern determined with Procedure 1 when the two collections $(\mathcal{I}_B^{(i)}, \mathcal{I}_C^{(i)})$ are considered. Then, under assumption A1, $(\mathcal{I}_B^*, \mathcal{I}_C^*, \mathcal{K}^*)$, where $\mathcal{K}^* = \bigcup_{j=1}^{k+1} \mathcal{K}^{(j)}$ is a solution to $\mathcal{P}_2^s$.

In addition, a solution to $\mathcal{P}_2^s$ can be determined in polynomial time, more precisely, $\mathcal{O}(k \max\{|\mathcal{V}| + |\mathcal{E}|, (|\mathcal{I}_B^*| + |\mathcal{I}_C^*|)^{\frac{5}{2}}\})$, where $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{E}$ are the number of vertices and edges of $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{B}(\mathcal{I}_B^*), \bar{C}(\mathcal{I}_C^*))$, respectively. ◇

C. Discussion of the Results

Next, we discuss two modifications of problem $\mathcal{P}_2$ (or equivalently, $\mathcal{P}_2^s$), as well as the corresponding results and computational complexity. First, suppose that the matrices $\bar{B}$ and $\bar{C}$ in problem $\mathcal{P}_2$ are initially given, with possibly more than one non-zero entry in each column and row, respectively. In addition, let $\mathcal{I}_B$ and $\mathcal{I}_C$ be the set of indices corresponding rows and columns, respectively. Thus, $\bar{B}(\mathcal{I}_B)$ and $\bar{C}(\mathcal{I}_C)$ consist of sub-matrices of $\bar{B}$ and $\bar{C}$ containing the columns and rows indexed by $\mathcal{I}_B$ and $\mathcal{I}_C$, respectively. The solution to $\mathcal{P}_2$ would require to determine the minimum number of actuators and sensors that ensure structural controllability and observability respectively, and the result presented in Theorem 5 holds. Nonetheless, determining the minimum number of such actuators and sensors is

an NP-hard problem [45]. Similar reasoning applies to Corollary 3 to obtain a solution to $\mathcal{P}_2^s$; hence, yielding the same computational complexity results.

The second problem modification consists in assuming that the actuation and sensing capabilities are arbitrary, i.e., these can control and measure a linear combination of several state variables. Further, we are still interested in actuating and measuring the minimum number of state variables. Then, the problem statement is given as follows.

$\mathcal{P}_2^0$ Given $\bar{A}$, and a maximum of k actuator-sensor-communication failures, we want to determine $(\bar{B}^*, \bar{C}^*, \bar{K}^*)$ that is a solution to the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \arg\min_{\bar{B},\bar{C},\bar{K}} \quad & \|\bar{B}\|_0 + \|\bar{C}\|_0 + \|\bar{K}(\mathcal{K})\|_0 \\ \text{s. t.} \quad & (\bar{A}, \bar{B}(\mathcal{I}_B \setminus \mathcal{J}_B), \bar{C}(\mathcal{I}_C \setminus \mathcal{J}_C); \mathcal{K}, \mathcal{J}) \text{ has no struct.} \\ & \text{resilient fixed modes, for all } \mathcal{J} \subset \mathcal{K}, \mathcal{J}_B \subset \mathcal{I}_B, \\ & \mathcal{J}_C \subset \mathcal{I}_C, \text{ and } |\mathcal{J}| \leq k, |\mathcal{J}_B| \leq k, \ |\mathcal{J}_C| \leq k, \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where $\|M\|_0$ counts the number of nonzero entries in M, and $\bar{B}(\mathcal{I})$ and $\bar{C}(\mathcal{J})$ corresponds to the sub-matrices of $\bar{B}$ with columns indexed by $\mathcal{I}$ and $\bar{C}$ with rows indexed by $\mathcal{J}$, respectively. In addition, $\bar{B} \in \{0,1\}^{n\times(nk)}$, $\bar{C} \in \{0,1\}^{(nk)\times n}$ and $\bar{K} \in \{0,1\}^{(nk)\times(nk)}$, that accounts for the worst case scenario where $\bar{B}$ and $\bar{C}$ has k copies of the identity matrix. In particular, it follows that $\mathcal{I}_B = \{1, \ldots, nk\}$, and $\mathcal{I}_C = \{1, \ldots, nk\}$.

Subsequently, a solution to $\mathcal{P}_3$ can be determined as follows:

Theorem 6: Let $\mathcal{I}_B^{(i)}$ and $\mathcal{I}_C^{(i)}$, with $i = 1, \ldots, k+1$, be k minimum collections of state variables of a state digraph $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A})$ that need to be actuated and measured to ensure structural controllability and observability, under assumption A1. In addition, consider $\bar{B}^* = [\mathbf{1}(\mathcal{I}_B^{(1)}) \ \ldots \ \mathbf{1}(\mathcal{I}_B^{(k+1)}) \ \mathbf{0} \ \ldots \ \mathbf{0}]$, and $\bar{C}^* = [\mathbf{1}(\mathcal{I}_C^{(1)}) \ \ldots \ \mathbf{1}(\mathcal{I}_C^{(k+1)}) \ \mathbf{0} \ \ldots \ \mathbf{0}]$, where $\mathbf{1}(\mathcal{I})$ is the vector with ones in the entries indexed by $\mathcal{I}$ and zero otherwise, and $\mathbf{0}$ is the vector of zeros with appropriate dimensions. Further, $\mathcal{K}^*$ be the index pairing of $\langle \mathbb{K}, \mathbb{K} \rangle$, where $\mathbb{K} \equiv \{1, \ldots, k+1\}$. Then, $(\bar{B}^*, \bar{C}^*, \bar{K}(\mathcal{K}^*))$ is a solution to $\mathcal{P}_3$.

In addition, a solution to $\mathcal{P}_3$ can be determined in polynomial time, more precisely, $\mathcal{O}(\max\{|\mathcal{V}| + |\mathcal{E}|, (k+1)^{\frac{5}{2}}\})$, where $|\mathcal{V}|$ and $|\mathcal{E}|$ are the number of vertices and edges of $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{C})$, respectively. $\diamond$

Intuitively, Theorem 6 states that we need $k+1$ actuators and sensors, where each actuator manipulates a linear combination of exactly one state variable in each non-top linked SCC of $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A})$, and each sensor measures a linear combination of exactly one state variable in each non-bottom linked SCC of $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A})$. In addition, each sensor forwards data to one actuator, no sensor feds data to two different actuators, neither an actuator receives data from two different sensors, which implies that exactly $k+1$ communication links are required.

VI. STABILIZING THE CLOSED-LOOP SYSTEM

Now, we discuss how the parameters in K, i.e. the *gain*, can be determined when the parameters of (A, B, C) are known, and such that the closed-loop system is always asymptotically stable even if some failure occurs. Recall that a communication failure mimics the dedicated actuator-sensor failure, see Remark 3. Consequently, we are left to ensure that K is such that the eigenvalues of $A+BKC$ lie within the unit circle in the complex plane for $K \in [\bar{K}]_{p,m}^{\Gamma_i}$ for $i \in \Delta$. This condition is equivalent to say that $\tilde{A}(K) = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & K \end{bmatrix}$ is Schur. Subsequently, $\tilde{A}$ is Schur if there exists a matrix X such that the Lyapunov inequality $X - \tilde{A}(K)^\intercal X \tilde{A}(K) \succ 0$, or equivalenty (by Schur decomposition), $\begin{bmatrix} X & \tilde{A}(K)^\intercal \\ \tilde{A}(K) & X \end{bmatrix} \succ 0$, i.e. a linear matrix inequality (LMI). Nonetheless, notice that if the parameters (A, B, C) are known, then the LMI is not linear in the design parameter K. In fact, this is not a problem if K can be arbitrary (i.e., not constrained to a specific information pattern), since an algebraic manipulation can be taken in consideration to obtain a set of LMIs that are linear in the design parameters, see [46] for details. Yet, because we want to determine K subject to an information pattern $\bar{K}(\mathcal{K}^*)$ we can no longer apply standard procedures, and these problems are known to be NP-hard [47].

First, consider the following result that provides an alternative characterization of Schur matrices.

Theorem 7 ([48]): A matrix $\tilde{A}(K)$ is Schur if and only if there exist symmetric, positive-definite matrices X and Y such that $\begin{bmatrix} X & \tilde{A}(K)^\intercal \\ \tilde{A}(K) & Y \end{bmatrix}$, and $X = Y^{-1}$. $\diamond$

Notice that Theorem 7 allow us to describe the stabilizability criteria in terms of LMI that are linear in the design parameter K. As a drawback, we have the constraint $X = Y^{-1}$ that is non convex; therefore, we approximate the constraint $X = Y^{-1}$ with an optimization problem via the following result.

Lemma 6 ([49]): Two positive definite $n \times n$ matrices $X, Y \in \mathbb{S}_+^n$, where $\mathbb{S}_+^n$ is the set of all positive definite $n \times n$ matrices, satisfy $X = Y^{-1}$ if and only if X, Y are a solution to the following optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{X,Y \in \mathbb{S}_+^n} \quad & \text{trace}(XY) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \begin{bmatrix} X & I \\ I & Y \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0 \end{aligned}$$

and the optimal cost is n. $\diamond$

From Theorem 7 and Lemma 6 we obtain the following result.

Theorem 8: Given (A, B, C), a set of possible communications between sensors and actuators $\mathcal{K}$ and a collection of possible communication failures $\{\Gamma_i\}_{i \in \Delta}$, with $\Gamma_i \subset \mathcal{K}$, the $N \times N$ matrix $\tilde{A}(K)$ is

Schur, where $K \in [\bar{K}(\mathcal{K})]^{\Gamma_i}$ for $i \in \Delta$, if and only if the following optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{K \in [\bar{K}]^{\Gamma_i}, i \in \Delta;\ X,Y \in \mathbb{S}_+^N} \quad & \text{trace}(XY) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \begin{bmatrix} X & \tilde{A}^\intercal(K) \\ \tilde{A}(K) & Y \end{bmatrix} \succ 0 \\ & \begin{bmatrix} X & I \\ I & Y \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where $\tilde{A}(K) = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & K \end{bmatrix}$, is feasible with optimal cost N. ◇

Remark 6: Theorem 8 provides a characterization of the solutions with linear constraints, but the objective is still non convex. Notwithstanding, trace(XY) can be approximated [49] by a linear function of trace$(Y_0X + X_0Y)$ for any matrices X_0 and Y_0, up to an additive constant. In addition, in [49] and iterative method with cost trace$(Y_kX_{k+1} + X_kY_{k+1})$ will always converge, and the constraint $Y = X^{-1}$ satisfied if the cost converges to $2N$. ◇

Subsequently, in Algorithm 1 we propose an algorithm that incorporates all the above features, and from Remark 6 it readily follows the next result.

Theorem 9: Algorithm 1 determines a Schur matrix $\tilde{A}(K)$ with $K \in [\bar{K}]^{\Gamma_i}$ for $i \in \Delta$, if the sequence trace$(Y_kX_{k+1} + X_kY_{k+1})$ converges to $2N$. ◇

Remark 7: Each iteration of Algorithm 1 can be efficiently solved using standard LMI toolboxes, but to the best of authors knowledge there is no form to estimate the number of required iterations for the algorithm to converge. In [50] some experiments and comparisons on the convergence rates were obtained, and in [51] some modification of the algorithms were provided to improve the rate of convergence, but these depend on a the selection of X_0 and Y_0. ◇

VII. Illustrative example

In this section, we illustrate the main results obtained in the context of the power electric grid. We first introduce the dynamical model and its digraph representation in Section VII-A and Section VII-B, respectively. Next, in Section VII-C we consider the IEEE 5-bus system and provide the solution to problem $\mathcal{P}_2$ (or equivalently, $\mathcal{P}_2^s$) when $k = 1$ actuator-sensor-communication failure can occur, and compute the gain subject to information pattern constraints as proposed in Algorithm 1.

ALGORITHM 1: Stabilizability of the closed-loop system with possible communications between sensors and actuators given by $\mathcal{K}$, and a collection of possible communication failures $\{\Gamma_i\}_{i\in\Delta}$, with $\Gamma_i \subset \mathcal{K}$

Input: The system (A, B, C), a set of possible communications between sensors and actuators $\mathcal{K}$ and a collection of possible communication failures $\{\Gamma_i\}_{i\in\Delta}$, with $\Gamma_i \subset \mathcal{K}$.

Output: a matrix K such that $\tilde{A}(K)$ is Schur for $K \in [\bar{K}]^{\Gamma_i}$, with $i \in \Delta$.

1: Find feasible points X_0, Y_0 and K_0 that satisfy the constraints in (8). If a feasible point does not exist, then it is not possible to stabilize the system with such information pattern constraints;

2: At iteration $k > 0$, from X_k, Y_k obtain the matrices X_{k+1}, Y_{k+1} and K_{k+1} solving

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{K\in[\bar{K}]^{\Gamma_i}, i\in\Delta;\ X,Y\in\mathbb{S}_+^N} \quad & \text{trace}(Y_k X_{k+1} + X_k Y_{k+1}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \begin{bmatrix} X & \tilde{A}^\intercal(K) \\ \tilde{A}(K) & Y \end{bmatrix} \succ 0 \\ & \begin{bmatrix} X & I \\ I & Y \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{A}(K) = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & K \end{bmatrix}$.

3: If the matrix

$$\tilde{A}_{k+1} = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & K_{k+1} \end{bmatrix}$$

is Schur for $K_{k+1} \in [\bar{K}]^{\Gamma_i}, i \in \Delta$, stop the algorithm. Otherwise, set $k = k + 1$ and go to Step 2.

A. Dynamical Model of the Power Electric Grid

Consider the electric power grid as modeled in [52] that consists in a linearized model under normal operating conditions. It can be written in terms of interconnected dynamical subsystems consisting in synchronous generators and loads, denoted by G and L. The network topology of the electric power grid is given by an undirected graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, where the vertices in $\mathcal{V}$ identify the buses and $\mathcal{E}$ are the edges representing the transmission lines between buses. Further, the electric power grid can be represented by the triple $\mathcal{N} \equiv (\mathcal{G}, \{G_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}, \{L_j\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}})$, where $\mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{J}$ are the indices of the buses that generators and loads are connected to, respectively. The dynamics of the electric power grid and its components, modeled as in [52], is described by the following state variables: $P_{T_{G_i}}$ represents the mechanical power of the turbine of the generator G_i, ω_{G_i} the generator G_i frequency and a_{G_i} its valve opening. In addition, l_{L_j} is the real energy consumed by the aggregate load L_j and ω_{L_j} the frequency measured at load L_j location. The different components are connected through the injected/received power to/from the network at the connection site, which dynamics depend on the frequency of the

components on the neighboring buses; the injected/received power variables for generator i and load j are P_{G_i} and P_{L_j}, respectively.

B. Digraph Representation of the Dynamical Model of the Power Electric Grid

The state digraph representation $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}_{G_i})$ and $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}_{L_j})$ of a generator i and a load j (as modeled in [52]) are depicted in Figure 3, with dynamics structure given by $\bar{A}_{G_i}$ and $\bar{A}_{L_j}$, respectively. If these are annexed to a bus, hence to the network, then the induced dynamics is coupled with the power injected/received to/from the network, as described in Section VII-A. Thus, the digraph representation of the dynamics has bidirectional connection between these new variables and the frequency of the corresponding components (corresponding to the injected/received power to/from the network), as depicted in Figure 3.



Fig. 3: Coupling between two neighboring components, a load and a generator; $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}_{G_i})$ and $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}_{L_j})$ are the generator and load state digraphs, and the state variables are described in Section VII-A.

Further, if the load j and generator i are attached to the same bus, or different buses but there exists a transmission line between those, there exists an edge (i', j') in the network topology $\mathcal{G}$; consequently, the frequency of the components at bus i' affects the dynamics of the power of the components at bus j', which implies that the digraph of the interconnected dynamics has outgoing edges from the frequencies of the components into the power of the components in the neighboring buses, for example, in Figure 3 is depicted a state digraph, where a generator is connected to bus i', a load is connected to bus j' and both buses are connected through a transmission line.

From the above description, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 10: Consider a power electric grid with network topology $\mathcal{N} \equiv (\mathcal{G}, \{G_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}, \{L_j\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}})$, where $\{G_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}$ and $\{L_j\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}}$ denote the set of $|\mathcal{J}|$ loads and $|\mathcal{I}|$ generators, respectively. If the network topology $\mathcal{N}$ is such that $\mathcal{G}$ is connected, then $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}(\mathcal{N}))$, where $\bar{A}(\mathcal{N})$ is the dynamic of the power electric grid with network topology given by $\mathcal{N}$, corresponding to the digraph representation of the dynamics of the electric power grid is composed of several SCCs, where $\max\{1, |\mathcal{J}|\}$ are non-top linked SCCs, and $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}(\mathcal{N}))$ is spanned by cycles. $\diamond$

TABLE I: Correspondence between state variables and its physical interpretation.

State Var	Physical Var	State Var	Physical Var
x_1	w_{G_1}	x_2	$P_{T_{G_1}}$
x_3	a_{G_1}	x_4	w_{G_2}
x_5	$P_{T_{G_2}}$	x_6	a_{G_2}
x_7	w_{G_3}	x_8	$P_{T_{G_3}}$
x_9	a_{G_3}	x_{10}	w_{L_1}
x_{11}	l_{L_1}	x_{12}	w_{L_2}
x_{13}	l_{L_2}	x_{14}	P_{G_1}
x_{15}	P_{G_2}	x_{16}	P_{G_3}
x_{17}	P_{L_1}	x_{18}	P_{L_2}



Fig. 4: Network topology $\mathcal{N} \equiv (\mathcal{G}, \{G_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}}, \{L_j\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}})$ of a 5-bus system consisting of 3 synchronous generators connected to 2 aggregate loads.

C. Simulation Results

The IEEE 5-bus power system, with the network topology $\mathcal{N} \equiv (\mathcal{G}, \{G_i\}_{i\in\mathcal{I}\}}, \{L_j\}_{j\in\mathcal{J}})$ depicted in Figure 4, is used as benchmark model in power systems. It corresponds to an electric power grid composed by 5 buses (depicted by black thick lines in Figure 4), interconnected through transmission lines (depicted by black solid lines in Figure 4). Here, we consider $|\mathcal{I}| = 3$ generators and $|\mathcal{J}| = 2$ loads, coupled through the network topology, depicted in Figure 4 by G_i $(i = 1, 2, 3)$ and $\mathcal{L}_j$ $(j = 1, 2)$, respectively. The state digraph $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}(\mathcal{N}))$, where $\bar{A}(\mathcal{N})$ is the dynamic of the power electric grid with network topology given by $\mathcal{N}$, is depicted in Figure 5, and it consists of 18 state variables, which physical interpretation is given in Table I.

We start by noticing that the state digraph depicted in Figure 5 consists of three SCCs, where one is non-bottom linked and the other two are non-top linked SCCs, as prescribed by Theorem 10. Let us

denote the not-top linked SCCs containing the state variable x_{11} (belonging to load 1) and x_{13} (belonging to load 2) by $\mathcal{N}_1^T$ and $\mathcal{N}_2^T$, respectively. In addition, let us denote the non-bottom linked SCC by $\mathcal{N}_1^B$. From Proposition 1, in order to fulfill Corollary 3, we have that $(\mathcal{I}_B^{(1)} \equiv \{1,2\}, \mathcal{I}_C^{(1)} \equiv \{1\})$ and $(\mathcal{I}_B^{(2)} \equiv \{3,4\}, \mathcal{I}_C^{(2)} \equiv \{2\})$ correspond to two possible minimum collections of dedicated inputs and outputs ensuring structural controllability and observability, respectively. In addition, $\mathcal{I}_B^* = \{11, 13, 11, 13\}$ and $\mathcal{I}_C^* = \{10, 12\}$, which implies that $\bar{B}(\mathcal{I}_B^*) = [e_{11}\ e_{13}\ e_{11}\ e_{13}]$ and $\bar{C}(\mathcal{I}_C^*) = [e_{10}\ e_{12}]^\intercal$, where $e_i \in \mathbb{R}^{18}$ denotes the i^{th} canonical vector with 1 in entry i and zero elsewhere, ensure structural controllability and observability when one dedicated actuator-sensor fails, recall Lemma 4 and Lemma 5. Notice that from a physical point of view the actuation of the variables x_{11} and x_{13} means that we just need to be able to actuate the real power consumed by the aggregate load. In particular, the actuation capabilities considered assume that the generators inject electric power at a constant rate, delegating the responsibility of stabilizing the network to the loads; in other words, the loads can both receive and inject electric power in the network, playing the role of *prosumers*. It is also worth noting that the state variables considered to be measured were the frequency of the aggregate load since it is locally inferred by one of the loads, hence, requiring effective communication over a network of one data package to the remaining load. Nonetheless, any other state variable in the non-bottom linked SCC would be a viable option.

Now, consider Procedure 1 when $(\mathcal{I}_B^{(1)}, \mathcal{I}_C^{(1)})$ is considered. Then, $\mathcal{B} \equiv \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{I}_B^{(1)}, \mathcal{I}_C^{(1)}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{I}_B^{(1)}, \mathcal{I}_C^{(1)}})$ where $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{I}_B^{(1)}, \mathcal{I}_C^{(1)}} = \{(1,1), (2,1)\}$, i.e., the the dedicated actuators controlling the state variables in the non-top linked SCC $\mathcal{N}_1^T$ and $\mathcal{N}_2^T$ reach the dedicated sensor measuring the state variable in the non-bottom linked SCC $\mathcal{N}_1^B$. A possible maximum matching M^* associated with $\mathcal{B}$ is $M^* = \{(2,1)\}$, which implies that $\mathcal{K} = \{(1,2)\}$ is a possible sequential-pairing. In particular, as prescribed by Remark 1, $M^* \cup \mathcal{K} = \{(1,2), (2,1)\}$ forms a cycle. Subsequently, $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{B}(\mathcal{I}_B^*), \bar{C}(\mathcal{I}_C^*), \bar{K}(\mathcal{K}))$ contains only one non-top and one non-bottom linked SCC containing state variables. Therefore, we just need to consider $\mathcal{K}' = \{(1,1)\}$ as prescribed in Procedure 1, and it follows that $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{B}(\mathcal{I}_B^*), \bar{C}(\mathcal{I}_C^*), \bar{K}(\mathcal{K}^{(1)} \equiv \mathcal{K} \cup \mathcal{K}'))$ has a single SCC containing state variables with two feedback links on it.

Similarly, Procedure 1 can be used when the pair $(\mathcal{I}^{(2)}, \mathcal{I}^{(2)})$ is considered, which leads to $\mathcal{K}^{(2)} = \{(2,3), (2,4)\}$. The digraph $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{B}(\mathcal{I}_B^*), \bar{C}(\mathcal{I}_C^*), \bar{K}(\mathcal{K}^* \equiv \mathcal{K}^{(1)} \cup \mathcal{K}^{(2)}))$ that accounts for the obtained solution is depicted in Figure 5.

In addition, by noticing that all state variables in $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A})$ have self-loops, it follows that assumption A1 holds. Hence, invoking Theorem 5, we obtain that $(\mathcal{I}_B^*, \mathcal{I}_C^*, \mathcal{K}^*)$ is a solution to $\mathcal{P}_2$ when $k = 1$. In addition, it readily follows that Corollary 3 is also verified, which implies that $(\mathcal{I}_B^*, \mathcal{I}_C^*, \mathcal{K}^*)$ is also a solution to $\mathcal{P}_2^s$ when $k = 1$.



Fig. 5: This figure presents the digraph $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{C}, \bar{K}(\mathcal{K}^*))$, with four dedicated actuators depicted in blue, two dedicated sensors depicted in dark green, and the feedback links depicted by gray arrows. The state digraph representation of the 5-bus system is enclosed by the red round box, where the state vertices in gray and black belong to load 1 and 2, respectively. The state vertices in red, orange and brown belong to generator 1, 2 and 3, respectively. The different SCCs are enclosed the dashed boxes, where the squared dashed boxes represent the non-top linked SCCs and the remaining SCC is non-bottom linked. Finally, notice that all state variables have self-loops depicted by green edges. The physical interpretation of the state variables is given in Table I.

Now, consider Algorithm 1 when all generators and loads have equal parameterization, perturbed by zero mean Gaussian noise with standard deviation squared equal to 0.1. In particular, the nonzero entries of A are as follows: $A_{1,1} = 0.2309$, $A_{3,1} = 0.8005$, $A_{14,1} = 0.7662$, $A_{15,1} = 0.9755$, $A_{17,1} = 1.0123$, $A_{1,2} = 0.6275$, $A_{2,2} = 0.1166$, $A_{1,3} = 0.4365$, $A_{2,3} = -0.1303$, $A_{3,3} = -0.0100$, $A_{4,4} = 0.2154$, $A_{6,4} = 0.8283$, $A_{14,4} = 1.1273$, $A_{15,4} = 0.7095$, $A_{16,4} = 1.0272$, $A_{17,4} = 1.1220$, $A_{4,5} = 0.8733$, $A_{5,5} = 0.1938$, $A_{4,6} = 0.3790$, $A_{5,6} = -0.0800$, $A_{6,6} = 0.2679$, $A_{7,7} = 0.1458$, $A_{9,7} = 1.1761$, $A_{15,7} = 0.7831$, $A_{16,7} = 0.6320$, $A_{18,7} = 0.9408$, $A_{7,8} = 0.6544$, $A_{8,8} = 0.1681$, $A_{7,9} = 0.3592$, $A_{8,9} = -0.2192$, $A_{9,9} = 0.0637$, $A_{10,10} = 0.4795$, $A_{14,10} = 0.8029$, $A_{15,10} = 0.8851$, $A_{17,10} = 0.5781$, $A_{18,10} = 1.0721$, $A_{10,11} = -0.0275$, $A_{11,11} = 0.7626$, $A_{12,12} = 0.2686$, $A_{16,12} = 0.7851$, $A_{17,12} = 1.0285$, $A_{18,12} = 0.4553$, $A_{12,13} = 0.1462$, $A_{13,13} = 0.7775$, $A_{1,14} = 0.0491$, $A_{14,14} = 0.4760$, $A_{4,15} = 0.2080$, $A_{15,15} = 0.5730$, $A_{7,16} = -0.0535$, $A_{16,16} = 0.5155$, $A_{10,17} = 0.0492$, $A_{17,17} = 0.0407$, $A_{12,18} = -0.0668$, and $A_{18,18} = 0.2072$.

The eigenvalues of A have norms given as follows:1.0072, 0.7775, 0.7626, 0.6652, 0.6636, 0.6636, 0.6017, 0.5674, 0.5674, 0.4802, 0.4802, 0.4678, 0.4081, 0.3596, 0.3001, 0.3001, 0.1359, 0.1359. Hence, A is not stable since one eigenvalue lie outside the unitary circle in the complex plane. In addition, consider the set of communication links $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}^{(1)} \cup \mathcal{K}^{(2)}$, and assume that any communication link can fail or be compromised by an attacker, more precisely, $\Gamma_1 = \{(1,1)\}$, $\Gamma_2 = \{(1,2)\}$, $\Gamma_3 = \{(2,3)\}$ and

$\Gamma_4 = \{(2,4)\}$. Observe that due to the design proposed in Corollary 3, it follows that a communication failure mimics the dedicated actuator-sensor failure, since there is a one-to-one correspondence. In other words, it is intuitive to see that if a sensor fails, there is no data to be communicated, and if an actuator fails there is no entity that will process the communicated data. Consequently, by performing Algorithm 1, we obtain the following gain:

$$K = \begin{bmatrix} 0.6445 & 0 \\ -0.3043 & 0 \\ 0 & -1.0079 \\ 0 & -0.0000043329 \end{bmatrix},$$

where largest norm associated with the eigenvalue of the closed-loop system is 0.9918, which implies that all eigenvalues lie within the unit circle in the complex plane; hence, the closed-loop system is stable. In addition, if an actuator-sensor-communication failure encoded by Γ_i ($i = 1, \ldots, 4$) occurs, then the gains used by the closed-loop system are effectively modified due to loss of specific sensor-actuator feedback links, i.e., due to the failure, the closed-loop system effectively uses the following gains:

$$K^{\Gamma_1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ -0.3043 & 0 \\ 0 & -1.0079 \\ 0 & -0.0000043329 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$K^{\Gamma_2} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.6445 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1.0079 \\ 0 & -0.0000043329 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$K^{\Gamma_3} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.6445 & 0 \\ -0.3043 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -0.0000043329 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$K^{\Gamma_4} = \begin{bmatrix} 0.6445 & 0 \\ -0.3043 & 0 \\ 0 & -1.0079 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where the norm of the largest eigenvalue of the closed-loop system are 0.9981, 0.9983, 0.9989, and 0.9918, respectively. In summary, the closed-loop system remains stable under any of these effective gains, i.e., under any of the considered set of attack conditions.

Computational Implementation Details: We notice that the gain matrices have to be square due to the LMI constraint $\begin{bmatrix} X & I \\ I & Y \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0$, so we considered two additional sensors that do not measure any state variable, i.e., they correspond to columns of $\bar{C}$ with only zeros. For simulation purposes, we initialized X_0 and Y_0 to be 22×22 identity matrices. Therefore, as prescribed in Theorem 9 the gains to stabilize the closed-loop system exist if the cost function of the iterative algorithm (Algorithm 1) converges to 44, see Figure 6 for performance results. We resort to the CVX (as LMI solver) and Matlab to execute Algortihm 1, which terminated after approximately 50 minutes in an Apple laptop with the following specifications: 2.6 GHz Intel Core i5 with 8 GB (1600 MHz DDR3) of memory.



Fig. 6: In this figure we provide the convergence of Algorithm 1 when the input is as in Section VII-C. All the matrices after iteration 1409 are already Schur, where the objective value is approximately 44.003, but the optimal value 44 is not achieved until iteration 2651.

VIII. Conclusions and further research

In this paper, we provided a solution to the problem of determining the minimum number of actuators, sensors and communication between these, for linear discrete time-invariant plants, and such that desirable control objectives of the closed-loop system are achieved. Namely, those achieving arbitrary performance in terms of the system response and/or stabilizability with static output feedback, under possible disruptive scenarios such as natural failures, or attacks by malicious agents, of actuators, sensors and communication links.

More precisely, we introduced the notion of resilient fixed-modes free system that ensures the non-existence of fixed modes when the actuation-sensing-communication structure is compromised; hence, crucial to ensure the proper functioning of the system under failures and/or attacks. In addition, we provided a graph-theoretical representation that ensures almost always the non-existence of resilient fixed modes, which we used to address the problem of designing the minimum actuation-sensing-communication structure that ensures a system without resilient fixed modes almost always. Finally, we provided an optimization algorithm that ensures stabilizability of the closed-loop system under possible actuator-sensor-communication failures, and we illustrated the results in the context of smart grid, using the IEEE 5-bus system.

Future research will address how the proposed methodology can be extended to handle intermittent communication schemes and delays of data, as well as considering potential actuation-sensing-communication costs. In addition, we will focus on developing more efficient methods to find the gains satisfying information patterns ensuring the closed-loop system to have no resilient fixed modes.

APPENDIX

Proof of Theorem 2: The proof follows by comparison with the definition of structurally fixed modes and its characterization provided in Theorem 1. More precisely, from the definition of resilient fixed modes (Definition 1) it follows that $\Sigma(A, B, C; \mathcal{K}, \{\Gamma_i\}_{i\in\Delta}) = \emptyset$ if and only if $\bigcap_{K\in[\bar{K}(\mathcal{K})]^{\Gamma_i}_{p,m}} \sigma(A+BKC) = \emptyset$ for all $i \in \Delta$. Subsequently, by definition of structurally fixed mode, it follows that a system has no structurally resilient fixed modes with respect to an information pattern $\bar{K}(\mathcal{K})$ and a set of possible failures $\{\Gamma_i\}_{i\in\Delta}$ if and only if $(\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{C}; \mathcal{K}, \Gamma_i)$ has no structurally fixed modes for all $i \in \Delta$. Thus, invoking Theorem 1 the result follows. ■

Proof of Theorem 3: First, notice that by construction Procedure 1 provides a feasible solution. To show optimality, we proceed as follows: (i) we show that all dedicated actuators and sensors in the minimum collections ensuring structural controllability and observability are required; and (ii) we show that we need at least $|\mathcal{I}^*_C|$ (assuming $|\mathcal{I}^*_C| \geq |\mathcal{I}^*_B|$) feedback links. First, observe that (i) readily follows from Lemma 1. Secondly, all dedicated actuators and sensors must be used to obtain a feasible information pattern, since if there is one dedicated actuator (respectively, dedicated sensor) that is not used then, the non-top linked SCC (respectively, non-bottom linked SCC) that contains the state variable it controls (respectively, measures) will stand alone when the digraph associated with the closed-loop system is considered; hence, this SCC has no feedback link on it, which violates condition (a) in Theorem 1. In summary, we need to use $|\mathcal{I}^*_C|$ feedback links, i.e., $|\mathcal{K}^*| \geq |\mathcal{I}^*_C|$, and the result follows.

Finally, the computational complexity is due to the following components: $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{I}_B,\mathcal{I}_C}$ can be determined through a depth-first search rooted in the dedicated input $i \in \mathcal{I}_B$, which can be achieved in $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{V}|+|\mathcal{E}|)$. In addition, the sequential pairing requires the computation of the maximum matching associated with $\mathcal{B}$ that can be computed using the Hungarian algorithms, which runs in $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n}m)$ for a bipartite with n vertices and m edges, so we obtain $(|\mathcal{I}^*_B| + |\mathcal{I}^*_C|)^{\frac{5}{2}}$. Thus, because all the remaining operations have linear-time complexity, the result follows. ■

Proof of Theorem 4: The feasibility follows from noticing that each dedicated actuator and sensor must be involved in at least $k+1$ feedback links. More precisely, suppose by contradiction that this is not the case, then if a dedicated input has k (or less) feedback links, then when these k feedback links fail the dedicated input does not have any feedback link incoming on it. Therefore, the non-top linked SCC that contains the state variable it actuates does not belong to an SCC with a feedback link on it, which violates condition (a) in Theorem 1. Similar reasoning applies when dedicated sensors are considered. Thus, each dedicated actuator and sensor must be involved in at least $k+1$ feedback links, which is ensured by considering $\mathcal{K}^* = \mathcal{K}^{(1)} \cup \ldots \cup \mathcal{K}^{(k+1)}$, where $\mathcal{K}^{(i)}$ is determined using Procedure 1 and $\mathcal{K}^{(i)} \cap \mathcal{K}^{(j)} = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$. In addition, the optimality, i.e., the fact that $\bar{K}(\mathcal{K}^*)$ is a sparsest information

pattern ensuring that the closed-loop system has no structurally resilient fixed modes, follows from noticing that each dedicated actuator and sensor is involved in exactly in $k+1$ feedback links.

The computational complexity follows the same steps as in Theorem 3, by noticing that the procedure is executed k times, having in consideration Remark 5. ■

Proof of Lemma 4: The proof follows by invoking Proposition 1, and noticing that there must exists at least one state variable actuated in each non-top linked SCC after the failures occur. ■

Proof of Theorem 5: The feasibility is obtained as follows: (i) Lemma 4 and Lemma 5, prescribe the existence of $k+1$ minimum collections of dedicated actuators and sensors ensuring structural controllability and observability, respectively; (ii) for each minimum collection i of dedicated actuators and sensors, Theorem 4 ensures that $\bar{K}(\mathcal{K}^{(i)})$ is the sparsest information pattern ensuring a closed-loop system without structurally fixed modes; and (iii) because there exist $k+1$ digraphs verifying Theorem 1, i.e., $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A}, \bar{B}, \bar{C}, \bar{K}(\mathcal{K}^{(i)}))$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k+1$, it follows that Theorem 2 holds.

The optimality follows by noticing that minimum of the sum of the above quantities is achieved by the proposed design.

The computational complexity follows by reproducing the same steps as in Theorem 4 and noticing that determining k minimum collection of dedicated actuators and sensors, which requires only to identify the non-top and non-bottom linked SCCs, which can be achieved by determining the decomposition of the digraph $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A})$ into SCCs that can be implemented in $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{V}| + |\mathcal{E}|)$. ■

Proof of Theorem 6: First, notice that $\bar{B}^*$ and $\bar{C}^*$ correspond to $k+1$ actuators and sensors, where each actuator manipulates a linear combination of exactly one state variable in each non-top linked SCC of $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A})$, and each sensor measures a linear combination of exactly one state variable in each non-bottom linked SCC of $\mathcal{D}(\bar{A})$, respectively. In addition, each sensor forwards data to one actuator, no sensor feds data to two different actuators, neither an actuator receives data from two different sensors, which implies that exactly $k+1$ communication links are required. Finally, because any pair actuator-sensor ensures structural controllability and observability, respectively, it follows that an arbitrary pairing of these can communicate, while ensuring that Theorem 2 holds. In addition, the computational complexity can be derived as in Theorem 3, yet it is not required to compute k times the Procedure 1 since only a index-pairing is required.

■

Proof of Theorem 10: From the description above, if there exists a load L_j, then there is a non-top linked SCC given by l_{L_j}, see Figure 3. Further, a generator G_i with state variable P_{G_i} form an SCC and connects either to a similar (in structure) SCC, when the neighboring component is another generator, or to an SCC originated by a load containing ω_{L_j} and P_{L_j}. Hence, each load contributes with a non-top linked SCC, and if there are no loads and $\mathcal{G}$ is connected, we obtain a single SCC (composed by the

state variables associated with generators and the corresponding power state variables), also a non-top linked SCC. In addition, it is easy to see that there exists a single non-bottom linked SCC that collects all state variables except l_{L_i} for the loads i in the network. Finally, since every state variables have self-loops, the digraph is spanned by cycles. ■

REFERENCES

[1] N. Sandell, P. Varaiya, M. Athans, and M. Safonov, "Survey of decentralized control methods for large scale systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 108–128, Apr. 1978.

[2] D. Šiljak, *Large-Scale Dynamic Systems: Stability and Structure*, ser. Dover Civil and Mechanical Engineering Series. Dover Publications, 2007.

[3] D. Šiljak and M. Vukčevic, "Decentralization, stabilization, and estimation of large-scale linear systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 363–366, Jun 1976.

[4] S. Jain, F. Khorrami, and B. Fardanesh, "Decentralized stabilization and control of large-scale power systems with unknown interconnections," *International Journal of Control*, vol. 63, no. 3, pp. 591–608, Feb. 1996.

[5] T. M. Chen and S. Abu-Nimeh, "Lessons from Stuxnet," *Computer*, vol. 44, no. 4, pp. 91–93, Apr 2011.

[6] J. Weiss, "Assuring industrial control system (ics) cyber security," http://csis.org/publication/assuring-industrial-control-system-ics-cyber-security.

[7] M. B. Line, A. Zand, G. Stringhini, and R. Kemmerer, "Targeted attacks against industrial control systems: Is the power industry prepared?" *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Smart Energy Grid Security - SEGS '14*, 2014.

[8] T. Macaulay and B. Singer, *Cybersecurity for Industrial Control Systems: SCADA, DCS, PLC, HMI, and SIS*. Boca Raton, FL: Taylor and Francis, 2012.

[9] N. G. Tsoutsos, C. Konstantinou, and M. Maniatakos, "Advanced techniques for designing stealthy hardware trojans," in *Proceedings of the The 51st Annual Design Automation Conference on Design Automation Conference*, 2014, pp. 1–4.

[10] R. Karri, J. Rajendran, K. Rosenfeld, and M. Tehranipoor, "Trustworthy hardware: Identifying and classifying hardware trojans," *Computer*, vol. 43, no. 10, pp. 39–46, 2010.

[11] International Society of Automation, "ISA99, industrial automation and control system security," https://www.isa.org/isa99.

[12] International Electrotechnical Commission, "Industrial communication networks - Network and system security - Part 2-1: Establishing an industrial automation and control system security program," https://webstore.iec.ch/publication/7030.

[13] S.-H. Wang and E. Davison, "On the stabilization of decentralized control systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 18, no. 5, pp. 473 – 478, oct 1973.

[14] J. P. Corfmat and A. S. Morse, "Decentralized control of linear multivariable systems," *Automatica*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 479–495, Sep. 1976.

[15] Z. Gong and M. Aldeen, "Stabilization of Decentralized Control Systems," *Journal of Mathematical Systems, Estimation and Control*, vol. 7, pp. 1–16, 1997.

[16] A. Mahajan, N. Martins, M. Rotkowitz, and S. Yuksel, "Information structures in optimal decentralized control," in *IEEE 51st Annual Conference on Decision and Control*, Dec 2012, pp. 1291–1306.

[17] L. Bakule, "Decentralized control: An overview," *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 87–98, 2008.

[18] L. Bakule and M. Papik, "Decentralized control and communication," *Annual Reviews in Control*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 1–10, 2012.

[19] A. Alavian and M. Rotkowitz, "Fixed modes of decentralized systems with arbitrary information structure," in *21st International Symposium on Mathematical Theory of Networks and Systems*, Dec 2014, pp. 4032–4038.

[20] ——, "Stabilizing decentralized systems with arbitrary information structure," in *IEEE 53rd Annual Conference on Decision and Control*, Dec 2014, pp. 4032–4038.

[21] S. Yuksel, "Decentralized computation and communication in stabilization of distributed control systems," in *Proceedings of Information Theory and Applications Workshop, ITA*, 2009.

[22] C. Langbort and V. Gupta, "Minimal interconnection topology in distributed control design," *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 397–413, 2009.

[23] J.-M. Dion, C. Commault, and J. V. der Woude, "Generic properties and control of linear structured systems: a survey." *Automatica*, pp. 1125–1144, 2003.

[24] X. Liu, H. Lin, and B. M. Chen, "Structural controllability of switched linear systems," *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 12, pp. 3531 – 3537, 2013.

[25] C. Commault and J.-M. Dion, "Input addition and leader selection for the controllability of graph-based systems." *Automatica*, vol. 49, no. 11, pp. 3322–3328, 2013.

[26] Y.-Y. Liu, J.-J. Slotine, and A.-L. Barabási, "Controllability of complex networks," *Nature*, vol. 473, no. 7346, pp. 167–173, May 2011.

[27] S. Pequito, S. Kar, and A. P. Aguiar, "A framework for structural input/output and control configuration selection of large-scale systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control. Accepted as a Regular Paper*. [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/pdf/1309.5868

[28] S. Pequito, A. P. Aguiar, and S. Kar, "Minimum Cost Input/Output Design for Large Scale Linear Structural Systems," *Conditionally Accepted to Automatica*, 2015. [Online]. Available: http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2014arXiv1407.3327P

[29] S. Pequito, S. Kar, and A. Aguiar, "A structured systems approach for optimal actuator-sensor placement in linear time-invariant systems," in *Proceedings of American Control Conference*, June 2013, pp. 6108–6113.

[30] S. Pequito, S. Kar, and G. J. Pappas, "Minimum Cost Constrained Input-Output and Control Configuration Co-Design Problem: A Structural Systems Approach," *ArXiv e-prints*, Mar. 2015. [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/1503.02764

[31] S. Pequito, S. Kar, and A. P. Aguiar, "On the Complexity of the Constrained Input Selection Problem for Structural Linear Systems," *ArXiv e-prints*, Mar. 2014.

[32] S. Pequito, P. Bogdan, and G. J. Pappas, "Minimum Number of Probes for Brain Dynamics Observability," *To Appear in 54th Conference on Decision and Control 2015*, Dec. 2015. [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/pdf/1508.07073v1

[33] S. Pequito and G. J. Pappas, "Structural Minimum Controllability Problem for Linear Continuous-Time Switching Systems," *Submitted to IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, Jul. 2015. [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/pdf/1507.07207v1

[34] X. Liu, S. Pequito, S. Kar, B. Sinopoli, and A. P. Aguiar, "Minimum robust sensor placement for large scale linear time-invariant systems: A structured systems approach," *Submitted to IEEE Transactions on Network Science and Engineering*, 2014. [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/1507.07205

[35] J. F. Carvalho, S. Pequito, A. P. Aguiar, S. Kar, and P. G. J., "Static Output Feedback: On Essential Feasible Information Patterns," *To Appear in 54th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 2015. [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/1509.02383

[36] G. Ramos, S. Pequito, S. Kar, and A. P. Aguiar, "Analysis and Design of Electric Power Grids with p -Robustness Guarantees using a Structural Hybrid System Approach," *2015 European Control Conference*, 2015.

[37] C. H. Papadimitriou and J. Tsitsiklis, "A simple criterion for structurally fixed modes," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 4, no. 6, pp. 333 – 337, 1984.

[38] M. Sezer and D. Šiljak, "Structurally fixed modes," *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 60–64, Jul. 1981.

[39] T. H. Cormen, C. Stein, R. L. Rivest, and C. E. Leiserson, *Introduction to Algorithms*, 2nd ed. McGraw-Hill Higher Education, 2001.

[40] V. Pichai, M. E. Sezer, and D. Šiljak, "Brief paper: A graph-theoretic characterization of structurally fixed modes," *Automatica*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 247–250, Mar. 1984.

[41] M. Pajic, R. Mangharam, G. Pappas, and S. Sundaram, "Topological conditions for in-network stabilization of dynamical systems," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 794–807, April 2013.

[42] K. J. Reinschke, *Multivariable control: a graph theoretic approach*, ser. Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences. Springer-Verlag, 1988, vol. 108.

[43] T. Tao and V. Vu, "Random matrices have simple spectrum," *ArXiv e-prints*, Dec. 2014. [Online]. Available: http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2014arXiv1412.1438T

[44] J. P. Hespanha, *Linear Systems Theory*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton Press, Sep. 2009.

[45] S. Pequito, S. Kar, and A. P. Aguiar, "On the Complexity of the Constrained Input Selection Problem for Structural Linear Systems," *To Appear in Automatica 2015*, Mar. 2014. [Online]. Available: http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2014arXiv1404.0072P

[46] P. Seiler and R. Sengupta, "Analysis of communication losses in vehicle control problems," in *American Control Conference, 2001. Proceedings of the 2001*, vol. 2, 2001, pp. 1491–1496 vol.2.

[47] A. Mercado, R. Mercado, and K. J. R. Liu, "NP-hardness of the stable matrix in unit interval family problem in discrete time," *Systems and Control Letters*, vol. 42, pp. 261–265, 2001.

[48] M. de Oliveira, J. Camino, and R. Skelton, "A convexifying algorithm for the design of structured linear controllers," in *Proceedings of the 39th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, vol. 3, 2000, pp. 2781–2786 vol.3.

[49] L. E. Ghaoui, F. Oustry, and M. Aitrami, "A cone complementarity linearization algorithm for static output-feedback and related problems," *IEEE Transaction on Automatic Control*, pp. 1171–1176, 1997.

[50] M. de Oliveira and J. Geromel, "Numerical comparison of output feedback design methods," in *American Control Conference, 1997. Proceedings of the 1997*, vol. 1, Jun 1997, pp. 72–76 vol.1.

[51] P. Naghshtabrizi and J. P. Hespanha, "Anticipative and non-anticipative controller design for network control systems," in *Networked Embedded Sensing and Control*, ser. Lect. Notes in Contr. and Inform. Sci., P. J. Antsaklis and P. Tabuada, Eds. Berlin: Springer, 2006, vol. 331, pp. 203–218.

[52] M. D. Ilić, L. Xie, U. A. Khan, and J. M. F. Moura, "Modeling of future cyber-physical energy systems for distributed sensing and control," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics, Part A: Systems and Humans*, vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 825–838, July 2010.